



Proceedings

**North American
Academy of Liturgy
Annual Meeting**

Vancouver, British Columbia
4-6 January, 2018

Proceedings
of the
North American Academy of Liturgy

Annual Meeting
Vancouver, British Columbia
4-6 January, 2018

Editor

Stephanie Perdew VanSlyke

Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary, Evanston, Illinois, United States

Editorial Board

Kimberly Belcher

University of Notre Dame, South Bend, Indiana, United States

Christopher Grundy

Eden Theological Seminary, Webster Groves, Missouri, United States

Lizette Larson-Miller

Huron University College, University of Western Ontario, Canada

The North American Academy of Liturgy (NAAL) (<http://www.naal-liturgy.org>) is an ecumenical and interreligious association of liturgical scholars who collaborate in research concerning public worship. The Academy's purpose is to promote liturgical scholarship among its members through opportunities for exchange of ideas and to extend the benefits of this scholarship to the worshipping communities to which its members belong.

The *Proceedings* of the North American Academy of Liturgy is published annually by the Academy for its membership and for scholars, libraries, and religious communities and organizations that would benefit from the research and collaboration of the Academy.

Articles published in Part Three-Select Seminar Papers have been peer reviewed. Only papers presented at the annual meeting are eligible for review. Authors are responsible for the content of their submissions.

Subscriptions (one volume/year) or individual copies are \$25.00 each. Agency discount available. For information on standing orders or individual volumes, contact the NAAL subscription manager, David Turnbloom, University of Portland, Portland, Oregon, United States at turnbloo@up.edu

This periodical is indexed in the *ATLA Religion Database*®, published by the American Theological Library Association, 300 S. Wacker Dr., Suite 2100, Chicago, IL 60606; e-mail: atla@atla.com; <http://www.atla.com/>. This periodical is included in the products distributed by EBSCO Publishing, Inc., 10 Estes Street, Ipswich, MA, 01938-0682; <http://www.ebscohost.com>

©2018 North American Academy of Liturgy, Inc., Notre Dame, Indiana
All rights reserved.

Publication Number: ISSN 1055-338X

Contents

FOREWORD

PART 1—PLENARY SESSIONS

Introduction to the Vice-Presidential Address 3
Jennifer L. Lord

Vice-Presidential Address 5
Preaching: the Preservation of Fire
Melinda A. Quivik

Introduction of the Berakah Recipient 22
Janet Walton and Cynthia Wilson

The Berakah Award 24

Berakah Response 25
The Open Table of the World
Ruth C. Duck

PART 2—SEMINAR REPORTS

The Advent Project 36

Christian Initiation 38

Critical Theories and Liturgical Studies 42

Ecology and Liturgy 44

Environment and Art 45

Eucharistic Prayer and Theology 46

Exploring Contemporary and Alternative Worship 47

Feminist Studies in Liturgy 49

Formation for Liturgical Prayer 50

Historical Research: 16th Century to the Present 52

Issues in Medieval Liturgy 54

Liturgical Hermeneutics 56

Liturgical Language 58

Liturgical Music 61

Liturgical Theology 62

Liturgy and Comparative Theology 64

Liturgy and Culture 65

Problems in the Early History of Liturgy. 66

Queering Liturgy 71

Seminar on the Way 73

Word in Worship 76

PART 3—SELECT SEMINAR PAPERS

Just Liturgy: Connecting Theological Ethics and Liturgical Practice 79

Benjamin Durham

What’s in a Name?: Pronouns and Titles for God in the 2017 CCLI Top 100 . . 94

Taylor W. Burton-Edwards

Foreword

Stephanie Perdew VanSlyke, Editor

“We gather on the unceded traditional Coast Salish territory of the Musqueam, Squamish, and Tsleil-Waututh First Nations.” With these words, President Jennifer Lord opened the 2018 Annual Meeting of the North American Academy of Liturgy and each subsequent plenary gathering, reminding us of the sacred ground on which we met. The meeting took place in Vancouver, British Columbia from January 4 to January 6. In attendance were 221 participants, including fifty visitors.

Vice President Melinda A. Quivik titled her address, “Preaching: the Preservation of Fire,” after a quote attributed to the composer Gustav Mahler, “tradition is not the worship of ashes but the preservation of fire.” In her address, Rev. Dr. Quivik considered how “preaching holds liturgy’s feet to a fire worthy of preservation” in four moves. First, she defined fire, its distinction from ashes, and its relationship to preaching. Second, she offered a thick definition of tradition. Third, she considered the means and ends of preaching as they are “beholden to the traditions that emerged from the fire of faith,” as she put it. Finally, she assessed how the structure of images brought together in preaching allows worshippers to hear God’s word come alive. The Academy was blessed by her address.

The Academy’s Annual *Berakah* Award was given to Ruth C. Duck in recognition of her work as a hymn-writer, liturgical poet, and scholar of liturgical language as it intersects with feminist theology and trinitarian theology. In her acceptance and response, titled “The Open Table of the World,” Rev. Dr. Duck wondered “what it would mean for Christians and other people of faith to live sacramentally in public—sharing a table open to all and engaging a lifetime journey to which God calls us.” Through the examples of protests, gatherings, liturgies, and scriptural citations, she wove an illustration of God’s open table being set in public spaces.

The Academy Committee for 2018 included Jennifer Lord, president; Melinda Quivik, vice president; Anne Yardley, treasurer; Taylor Burton-Edwards, secretary; Annie McGowan, delegate for membership; Sharon Fennema, delegate for seminars; Joyce Ann Zimmerman, past president; and Don LaSalle, past president. The local committee assisted in planning a beautiful meeting in a beautiful setting.

At the business meeting, we welcomed fifteen new members of the Academy: Deborah Appler, Hannah Hwa-Young Chong, Brian Cones, Marty Haugen, Jonathan Hehn, Layla Karst, Swee Hong Lim, Martin Lüstraeten, Katharine Mahon, Mark Miller, Ellen Oak, Sonja Keren Pilz, Beth Richardson, Mikie Roberts, and Allie Utley. Together they bring a wealth of insight and experience to our mutual work. New officers elected were vice president Bruce Morrill and delegate for seminars Lisa Weaver. Anne Yardley was elected to another term as treasurer.

The majority of the Academy meeting takes place in seminars. The work of the seminars is documented in part two, with reports from the seminar meetings. As always the Academy is thankful to those who serve as seminar conveners.

Part three contains peer-reviewed essays which were presented in the seminars. The Academy appreciates the members of our editorial board, who read and reviewed the paper submissions. The editorial board consists of Kimberly Belcher, Christopher Grundy, and Lizette Larson Miller, who is completing her final year with the publication of this volume. We are additionally grateful to Arlene Collins for contracting to do the layout and design for this volume; to Academy member David Turnbloom for serving as subscriptions manger, and to Courtney B. Murtaugh for managing the final mailing and printing responsibilities.

The next meeting of the Academy will be in Denver, Colorado, January 3-5, 2019.



Part 1

Plenary Sessions

Introduction to the Vice-Presidential Address

Jennifer L. Lord

It is not only my duty, it is my joy to introduce you to our NAAL Vice-President, the Reverend Dr. Melinda Quivik, Lutheran Pastor, General Editor of the journal *Liturgy*, former professor of liturgy and homiletics. Her address is titled *Preaching: The Preservation of Fire*.

Melinda has distinguished credentials in the Academy and committed service to the church: She is a Minnesotan by birth. She completed her undergraduate at St. Olaf College in English Literature and Education. She moved on to complete an MA at Teachers College, Columbia University, in Philosophy of Education. She attended the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia, earning the Master of Divinity degree. She was ordained twenty-four years ago to the Ministry of Word and Sacrament, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, and served a pastorate in northeastern Montana, at Froid, Montana. She proceeded to work on her doctorate at the Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, California, receiving the PhD in what was then Area 7: Worship, Proclamation, and the Arts, choosing to focus her work in liturgical studies and homiletics. She herself has directed doctoral students' dissertations in both disciplines. Her own dissertation was titled *The Beautiful Funeral: The Aesthetics of a Liturgy*. She began teaching, first at Trinity Lutheran Seminary in Ohio and then at Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia.

Melinda's scholarly pursuits are expansive. They include two books on dying, death, and Christian funerals; a third book that is part of a well-received preaching series published in English, Mandarin, Indonesian, and, soon, Russian; and a fourth book, a comprehensive How-To and Why sourcebook on Worship for pastors and laypersons. Her works in progress include both liturgical and homiletical books.

She publishes with all the major Revised Common Lectionary online and print commentaries, all while editing many of us in this room as we submit essays for the journal *Liturgy*. And—all of this productivity while she serves as pastor, preaching weekly, for a Presbyterian-United Church of Christ Congregation.

She is a faithful and rigorous pastor-scholar, and wields the proverbial red pen in a way that can make you grateful, or ready for retreat. She was, after all, a junior high-school English teacher.

Alongside her vocation to study and write, she is a sought-after teacher and preacher/presider, resourcing national and regional church gatherings, even international seminaries—most recently in Indonesia, with a current invitation to Tanzania. She gave her time and effort to the work and promotion of the ELCA's *Renewing Worship* materials, which led to the *Evangelical Lutheran Worship* resources.

I can tell you that my Austin Seminary students, through her books, love her. They gratefully receive her clarity, her conviction, her resistance to any ways salt loses its flavor. Her voice comes through the printed page and the students relate. They would not be surprised to know that for all her scholarship she is, too, a pastor-public theologian for her community as she advocates for children who are in danger, marches and protests, still, regarding all manner of civil and human rights, and oversees her small congregation's service annually to some 8000 community persons seeking help with clothing, food, addictions, and job skills.

Sometimes an introduction is difficult because the one introducing does not know the one to be introduced. That is not the problem here; instead I know too much. So I will tell you two things. Not one, but two images I carry of my friend and colleague.

My earliest memory of Melinda Quivik is of her walking on Berkeley's version of Holy Hill: the GTU campus. She was not just walking. She was walking and exclaiming and gesticulating: "The trees! Look at the trees!" I would soon learn that she had just moved from that prairie land of Montana, a place of few if any trees. I would also learn that she was given to exclamations of all sorts—she has the gift of words coming quickly and she has the gift of rejoicing.

I also know this about Melinda, she worked four summers in a tower for the US Forest Service. She was a lookout, one whose job it was to watch for smoke. You might ask her about her reading list for those summers. But there's this: part of the lookout's job is to record storm data. So, in those summers in a watch-tower in Idaho and Montana, when the thunderstorms came, Melinda sat in the seat specially insulated with wood and glass so as not to conduct the storm electricity, and she did the other part of her job as she clicked a device in order to record each lightning flash.

In our recent season of fires we know fire-detection is important work. This morning we will hear about fire, evoking the literal even as we take time with the image. We will hear about the image of fire-in-relation-to-preaching from a scholar who knows what it means to pay attention to the trees, to count lightning strikes, and to watch for smoke. Join me in welcoming our Vice President, Melinda Quivik.

Vice-Presidential Address

Preaching: The Preservation of Fire

Melinda A. Quivik

As editor for the journal *Liturgy*, I get to read diverse perspectives on liturgical matters represented by members of this Academy and others. Four times a year:

- I learn about new research.
- I follow arguments that explain liturgical history or ritual.
- I get to trace nuances, to try on points of view not my own.

It is fascinating, enlightening, and also dumbfounding because this Academy, our guild, addresses a large topic: What happens when people gather to worship? And even more: What ought to happen?

It is impossible to reconcile the differences between our many perspectives in this Academy. We articulate our understandings of faith using many different patterns and sounds, gestures and images. We contend with whether our communities express a common worship pattern or multitudes of formats and goals. Through the tug and resolution of conflicting ideas, we hand over our ideas about these questions, hoping to find the sweetest fruit by engaging with someone else's view to see how it fits, whether it can make yet another understanding arise.

We set up for each other ways of knowing that describe what is real to us—keeping in mind that whether something is actual or not, it is real. In other words, the burning bush and empty tomb—whether actual or not—are real. And then, given what we hand over to the scrutiny of our seminar or the larger faith communities through our research and writing, praying, singing, presiding, and preaching, we work to reconcile contradictions.

Our task as leaders and scholars of liturgy is to shape a worship experience that will speak to people's needs, for as Pope Francis defines it, the church is "a sanctuary where the thirsty come to drink."¹ Maybe you can hear in this image something true for your worshiping community. I hear in it that people come to worship with their whole histories in tow. They come with pain. They seek renewal. Our job is to answer the need by examining the history, theology, ritual gestures, the ecclesiological structures, the music, and the silences that constitute liturgical practices. And we often—or, for some of us, always—include the preached word

because a living community is not only a place to drink but a place to be set aflame . . . and this is the most difficult piece of all to grasp.

I took as my subject for this address a quote ascribed to the classical composer Gustav Mahler: *Tradition is not the worship of ashes but the preservation of fire.*²

I hope it speaks across our diverse perspectives to what we have in common: *Tradition is not the worship of ashes but the preservation of fire.* Instead of looking at worship as a whole, I want to consider how preaching holds liturgy's feet to a fire worthy of preservation. What does it mean to say: *Preaching is not the worship of ashes but the preservation of fire.* Hence, the title: *Preaching: The Preservation of Fire.* I will explore in four moves how the purpose of preaching is to preserve the fire of faith.

First, we will look at fire: What is it exactly? What does it do? How is fire different from ashes? How is fire related to preaching?

Then I will address the role of tradition: the accumulation of polyvalent symbols that we believe has been handed to us by our ancestors. Although there are many traditions, to speak of tradition (singular) is to refer to the nugget or the primary plotline or the core practices of each tradition. When we critique tradition, we seek either to upend a teaching or to refine it. At least, we seek to understand.

Next, I want to think more explicitly about what I maintain is a locus of fire at the heart of the liturgy: preaching. What are preaching's ends; what are its means? Preaching is beholden to the traditions that emerged from the fire of faith.

Finally, I will assess how the very structure of images brought together engages us in hearing God's word come alive in preaching.

That's the plan: fire, tradition, preaching, and the structuring of images.

But first, a little backstory. Sharing visions brings uncertainty and even fear that our aims might be rejected or our conclusions found wanting. So who am I to offer my views? I used to own a bookstore and art gallery. I taught junior high English, worked for the U.S. Forest Service and in an electric cords factory. I have taught liturgy and preaching in seminaries, mentored doctoral students, given workshops, and served on church-wide consultations regarding worship. I, a Lutheran pastor, now lead a merged congregation of Presbyterians and Congregationalists. I write about preaching and liturgy and edit other's work. All of those experiences and my studies have caused me to want to talk about the fire of faith.

One soft summer evening when I was a pastor in eastern Montana, I was cooling off after a sweat at the Assiniboine and Sioux Fort Peck Indian reservation. I sat with a friend by the fire that had heated the rocks for both the men's and women's sweat lodges. I was on the reservation in an immersion experience orchestrated by

the Lutheran bishop's office and the tribe especially for church folks in the white communities—pastors and laity—to better understand our Indian neighbors. The churches I served were near the Fort Peck reservation.

The stars were just starting to appear above our heads. Because the fire was bright, when one of the tribal elders came to stand beside it, having just emerged from the men's sweat, I could see on his chest the scars of the SunDance. I don't remember saying anything to him. But he had been part of our day-long discussions and perhaps recognized me as one of the pastors.

He began to talk about his scars. He said that because the SunDance is arduous, when he first undertook it, the experience was the most important event in his life. His many scars showed that he had endured more than one vision quest. The SunDance involves several days of fasting and then the insertion of hooks into the bare chest. Ropes are attached to the hooks for dancing around a central pole in the SunDance shelter. The dancing, the ropes, the hooks cause enormous pain. You dance until the hooks are ripped out of your skin.

He said he learned, then, that when you have pain, you cannot give it away. It must be taken from you. You do not yourself have the power to give away your pain.

I have been thinking about this encounter ever since, as an image of how the word of God does its work. Faith that comes from hearing, as the Apostle Paul wrote, is poured into us by God's word. But a sermon is not a shallow answer or a salve that cools a burn. I want to talk about fire and tradition and preaching that speaks to human pain rather than preaching that trivializes what is at stake—all French Lacquer, thin veneer, churchy language. This is about preaching that gives life, because God's word—preached—bores deep, cleans out, makes room. But how does that fire take away pain?

Part 1. FIRE

From ancient times, fire was listed along with earth, water, and air as an equally essential element, but fire differs from the others. Earth, water, and air are matter; fire is not matter. Fire is a chemical reaction, a sensate form that creates change.³ Fire is the sun itself, the primal fount of life, fueling photosynthesis, warming our atmosphere. Here on Earth, fire begins to burn in the presence of oxygen when fuel is heated to combustion temperatures (about 300° F. for wood). Gases are given off, often as smoke. What remains is a charred substance, ash, not moving. Ashes are dead.

Tradition does not ask us to worship something dead. Instead, the traditions of worship invite us to turn toward an energy that changes what it touches. Fire's power both kills and gives birth.

- Fire gives light, reveals what surrounds it. We crouch around it in the dark in the forest to tell stories.
- Fire is warmth. We rub our hands over the blaze.
- Fire is a spark of insight, a sudden epiphany, the fire in someone's eyes.
- Fire is a combustion that reduces what it feeds on to something much smaller.
- Fire is mesmerizing and horrifying. We watch it consume a building (the Grenfell Tower, the Bronx), neighborhoods in towns (Santa Rosa, Ventura, Santa Barbara), forests (Lolo, Custer, Deerlodge) and more. We know the names.
- Fire is militant. We fire weapons. We fire verbal assaults on an opponent in a debate.
- Fire is passion. To be zealous is to be on fire— as when the winged seraphim bring burning coals to the lips of the Prophet Isaiah and he is sent out with a sermon to deliver (Isa. 6:6).
- Fire brings healing and renewal, even transformation: soft clay hardened into pottery; steel poured from the furnace white-hot.
- Fire for cooking allowed early humans to ingest the density of calories needed to grow the brains we have—far beyond the size of our closest primate cousins who were confined to raw foods.⁴

For four summers in my younger years, I worked for the U.S. Forest Service on look-out towers in Idaho and Montana watching for fires. I would see a little curl of smoke (the volatile gases) rise up out of a valley after a lightning storm (the beginning of a potentially dangerous fire), and I would call the ranger station to alert the fire crew.

All the properties of fire are at work in wildfire. When a forest has become so thick that sunlight cannot penetrate down to the forest floor, and it can no longer nurture small plants, fire burns away the canopy, opens it up. Fire causes what is not essential or healthy to disappear. It cleanses. Trees downed by fire rot to allow berry bushes to rise up out of the soil. Wildflowers explode in the meadows. The fire's heat snaps open tough lodgepole pine seeds. A new era of maturity begins. Fire both destroys and gives life. It is an image of what creates faith.

Some lines from the Hebrew Bible show the pervasive life of this image:

- the pillar of fire by night, to give them light (Exod 13.21)
- the god who answers by fire is indeed God (1 Kgs 18.24)
- the voice of the Lord flashes forth flames of fire (Ps 29.7)
- the light of Israel will become a fire (Isa 10.17)
- I am now making my words in your mouth a fire (Jer 5.14)
- within me there is something like a burning fire shut up in my bones (Jer 20.9)
- is not my word like fire, says the Lord (Jer 23.29)
- I will kindle a fire in you (Ezek 20.47)

From the New Testament:

- He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and fire (Mt 3.11)
- everyone will be salted with fire (Mk 9.49)
- I came to bring fire to the earth (Lk 12.49)
- Divided tongues, as fire, appeared among them (Acts 2.3)
- God is a consuming fire (Heb 12.29)
- And the tongue is a fire (Jas 3.6)

Preachers who are focused on preservation of fire know that the preached word is light, warm, luminous, militant, passionate, healing, renewing: hooks that dig in. God's word repeatedly uses fire as a force that describes what God is doing in our midst. But fire needs tending, too. Holy fire is safeguarded and kept alive by the gifts of tradition. So we now consider:

Part 2. TRADITION

Some years ago, a cookbook was published of recipes from Jewish women in the death camp, Theresienstadt.⁵ They would sit and talk about what they would cook for their children if they could, if they had the ingredients. They wrote down the recipes in German and Czech, but when those scraps of paper were collected and published more than twenty-five years later, it was clear that the recipes lacked sometimes key ingredients. The women were too malnourished to remember what was really in those dishes. The book, *In Memory's Kitchen*, was published as a tribute to mothers who dream of caring for their families even when they cannot.

Tradition creates the markers people need for stable places to regularly land, to know where we are, to teach and feed, and this is true especially when we are in trouble. Whoever said *tradition is not the worship of ashes but the preservation of fire* believed tradition needed defending in the face of those who say it is, if not damaging, at least passé.

And indeed, tradition is not in fashion in North America these days, because for some people, "tradition" is what seeks to cement, even deify rigid, rule-bound ways for its own sake. Liturgical tradition is, after all, not the easiest thing to market in a consumer-driven society. Yet, without the recipe that accurately names the ingredients required, the food cannot truly feed.

We all know people who dismiss religious community with what may feel like anger. When a friend's ten-year-old son heard me say I was a Lutheran, he asked his mother, "What is a Lutheran?" She told him, "It's an old, conservative religion." People may think that we who identify ourselves with long-standing communities of faith are merely circling around an unchanging, unquestioned, and preposterous idea. We have not conveyed the fact that most of us do not seek to glue God down on paper.

Twisted notions of tradition that regard what comes from the past as the worship of ashes do not honor—and cannot carry—the central fire. Those of us who see our tradition as a fire do not shun innovation. Just as we don't still cook in the fire-place, the forms tending the fire of tradition have also changed dramatically over time. Today, Christian preachers around the world relish the gift of the three-year lectionary which we experience as profoundly traditional—in the best sense—Sunday after Sunday in communities of every possible language and culture.

But how can preaching say what scripture intends? How ought the sermon be set up to give courage and hope to the assembly? Teachers of preaching and homiletical scholars over the centuries have worked hard on these questions. Their answers have variously defined the purpose of preaching. I want now to leapfrog through some of what scholars have described as the role of preaching in preserving the fire of faith.

Part 3. THEORIES of PREACHING

At least in the Christian tradition, preaching has generally moved through stages that re-defined again and again the best method for voicing a mystery. For me, the plumb line is tied to Augustine whose preaching manual, *On Christian Doctrine*, states very simply that the measure of a sermon's worth is whether it serves the "double love of God and of our neighbor."⁶ This is a litmus test whether the preaching is called a message or homily or sermon or reflection. The preaching may last fifty-five minutes or ten. It may be offered by an ordained clergy person, a licensed lay person, an itinerant charismatic, or someone else. Because we worshipping humans have many ways of speaking about deep matters, the preaching may be the voice that comes from the organ pipes or the bells. I am going to focus on preaching that uses words.

One big shift in our time—for many Protestants as well as Roman Catholics—came when the Second Vatican Council drew attention to the sermon's place within the liturgy, asserting that "the primary duty of priests is the proclamation of the Gospel of God to all."⁷ The U.S. Catholic Conference of Bishops' 1970 document *Fulfilled in Our Hearing* defined the preacher's task as "to speak from the Scriptures . . . to a gathered congregation in such a way that those assembled will be able to worship God . . . and then go forth to love and serve . . ."⁸

John Baldovin cited Yves Congar who affirmed the primacy of the preaching with these words: "I could quote a whole series of ancient texts, all saying more or less that if in one country Mass was celebrated for thirty years without preaching and in another there was preaching for thirty years without the Mass, people would be more Christian in the country where there was preaching."⁹

This is not to suggest a contest between the import of either the liturgy or the preaching. I hold with Martin Luther's insistence on the importance of both word

and sacrament. I see this balance exemplified in the Emmaus story: conversation on the road to Emmaus involving the stranger who conveyed the meaning of the prophets in terms of his own life, death, and resurrection, followed by a meal in which the stranger blessed the bread, broke it, gave it to his followers, and vanished. The story tells us the followers' hearts were burning with them on the road as the stranger spoke. Their eyes were opened when he broke the bread. Word and meal. The proclaimed Word and the edible Word. Not one without the other. Both.

Along with the Second Vatican Council's emphasis on preaching came the highly influential book from Fred Craddock, *As One Without Authority*, which named the uncomfortable truth—evident in the late 1960s—that preachers no longer had standing in the community.¹⁰ Preachers needed to switch from deductive assertion to induction—a whole new way to preach that also gave a different purpose to the sermon. The preacher should not draw conclusions about what to believe but should invite the hearers into a vision that would lead them to discover on their own the vitality of God. In a similar vein, Eugene Lowry showed that the sermon actually works like a short story or a novel—tracing Craddock's orientation, disorientation, reorientation.¹¹

Almost twenty years later, Lucy Rose addressed Craddock's authority problem by making everyone an authority.¹² The pulpit, she wrote, should be turned over to everyone, because the sermon should only be a "conversation starter." Any proclamation, she insisted, is authoritarian. According to her book's subtitle, the church was to become a roundtable church. The purpose of the sermon became faith through sharing.

A crucial voice from the black church, Henry Mitchell, in 1990, sought to synthesize "the 'mainstream' Protestant pulpit tradition in America, and the African American church pulpit tradition."¹³ The sermon should address the whole person, heart and mind, and do so, he wrote, with "a purposeful escalation of tension and suspense right up to the resolution" which was celebration.¹⁴

Nearly thirty years later, Duke University homiletics professor Luke Powery sought to broaden the emotional reach of the black church preaching traditions from Mitchell's celebration—often shorthand as: start low, go slow, rise high, strike fire, and sit down—to even include lament. Powery's "ecumenical pneumatology for preaching" made the sermon "a demonstration of the Spirit and of power," with room for both joy and grieving.¹⁵

Other homileticians urged the sermon to echo the genre of the Sunday texts so that the sermon might do what the texts intend to do. This was narrative preaching. So-called liturgical preaching pulled the sermon toward the table in order to bridge the sacramental natures of word and meal.

Linda Clader waded into the role of the imagination and prophetic voice by calling preachers to violate the listeners' expectations, to "keep [the] polished slabs of convention from stacking too neatly."¹⁶ Sally Brown of Princeton emphasizes the power of metaphoric language, urging exploration over explanation in line with Craddock's inductive emphasis.¹⁷ The hearer engages along with the preacher as an explorer.

Chief among those who turned our attention to theological matters (as distinct from matters of form) was Paul Wilson in Toronto. He called for the sermon to balance Bible and world in terms of both the Trouble and the Grace resident in each realm.¹⁸ Find the trouble in the biblical text and its analogous trouble in our world. Link them by naming them. Do the same with grace—the gifts and promises of God—in the biblical text and in the every-day world. This especially pushes the preacher to name God's contemporary presence instead of speaking only of the ancient world or abstractions.

Stanley Hauerwas gave the preaching task a hard edge, suggesting that preachers need to "presume that we are preaching to a Church in the midst of a war." He chastized those who use the sermon to give advice on how to live, or expound on matters of theology, writing: "I do not need something called the human condition to be illumined when I am preparing to face the enemy. Rather, I need to have a sense of where the battle is, what the stakes are, and what the long-term strategy might be."¹⁹

In the spirit of battle, homileticians have embraced the purpose of the sermon to be a message of freedom addressed to the oppressed or the oppressor or to both at once. Postcolonial, womanist, liberation, and ecologically concerned theorists seek the voices of the voiceless to be heard for the liberation of all. These scholars are found on every continent, in every racial and gender identity. Eunjoo Mary Kim's work on multicultural preaching helps with this, as does Kathy Black's focus on preaching and disability.

The sermon, thus, creates juncture—the spark between the words, between the persons, between the scripture and the meal, between the racial profiling and the life of the world. The question that lies behind all of these theories echoes Hauerwas: What are the stakes today in preaching? How do they vary according to context, social location, listeners' experiences, the needs of the world? Where does the preacher begin to sort through the demands?

John McClure's *otherwise preaching* sought to answer such questions and to do so in the name of postmodern complexity. He opposed the unthinking use of what feel like familiar modes of knowing—the analytical tools that make up the so-called Wesleyan Quadrilateral: Scripture, Reason, Experience, and Tradition. He headed each chapter as a final goodbye to each of these "houses" of knowledge. Yet, instead of exiting, he

nuanced them, calling for preachers to recognize the dangers in each “house,” watch out for the prejudices, attend to those who are excluded, and notice that depending on how we weight these ways of knowing, we come up with differing faith perspectives. He’s right. And I’m going to spend a bit more time on this one.

I appreciate McClure’s way of framing the preaching task because it honors the fact that we live *in* time, *in* contexts, *in* cultures, *in* ways of knowing and being known that are shaped by a host of changing circumstances, fully alive—to all of which preaching is continually attending. To buckle ourselves into the supposed certainty of any one source of knowledge about faith does not serve preaching that means to preserve the originating fire. Just as fire requires oxygen, heat, and fuel in order to stay alive, so the fire of faith requires a balance of sources for knowing.

- Not scripture alone (with apologies to Martin Luther who spoke in a different time to a particular struggle), for Luther, in fact, used his reason, experience, and the pieces of tradition he thought conveyed Christ, precisely to help him proclaim this Christ through “scripture alone.” But truly taking scripture on its own (apart from other ways of knowing) unmoors the Bible from its own full context and the current era.
- Not tradition alone or we would be subject to the tyrannies of history and power.
- Not reason alone or we could not get out from under the Enlightenment’s denial of non-scientific ways of knowing.
- Not experience alone or those of us who haven’t seen visions like those of Julian or Meister Eckhart may not belong. And those of us who do see visions would have no help in discerning their significance.

If we exit all of those “houses,” what do we have left to work with? If you “leave” the house, can you duck back in now and then for a meal?

Honoring these four dimensions of the fire of preaching acknowledges that none of us is an island; we belong to our ancestors as well as to our contemporaries. We live in worlds built by many visions, many stories, many characters, poems, admonitions, works of logic, emotions, and hope. None of us is sufficient unto ourselves. We continue to find value in asking:

- How did our ancestors interpret scripture?
- What experiences wrote the holy words and kept alive the treasure of God’s word?
- What arguments and what reasons, led to what conclusions?

Tending and sparking holy fire requires all these ways of knowing, scriptural story and personal experience thoughtfully interpreted within a living tradition: both Miriam’s dance (the fire of liberation) and Simon Peter’s passion (the fire of love as well as the zeal for self-preservation). Tradition and scripture—alive, experi-

enced, interpreted, proclaimed—do not seek the living among the dead but are out to announce resurrection, a reality that effects what it proclaims: for the living Word raises the dead. To be made alive is to feel.

The fire of faith is, in the end, an emotional experience. Pope Francis wrote of this very thing in *The Joy of the Gospel*, his 2013 teaching in which he refers to the homily as “words which set hearts on fire.”

[God and God’s] people speak to one another in a thousand ways directly, without intermediaries. But in the homily they want someone to serve as an instrument and to express their feelings in such a way that afterwards, each one may choose how he or she will continue the conversation. The word is essentially a mediator . . . To speak from the heart means that our hearts must not just be on fire, but also enlightened by the fullness of revelation and by the path traveled by God’s word in the heart of the Church and our faithful people throughout history.²⁰

In the pope’s words, we find tradition and scripture, experience and enlightenment tied together for the sake of the fire.²¹ The fire that preaching means to preserve is the impossible fire in the bush that did not burn and the dead man come to life, his companions’ hearts burning at his words.

These are unbelievable stories/images that we are told, that we re-tell, that we live by. They engender an awe that carries fear inside it . . . and also the seeds of hope. In order for preaching to nourish faith, to warm the heart (with a nod to Wesley), to “set hearts on fire” (as the pope puts it), the sermon must attend to the structure of its offering. Liturgical scholars know that the structure, the pattern, of the liturgy changes people, which bring us to the last point.

Preaching that intends to set hearts on fire needs to engage the hearers in their own fire-building. You lay the twigs and then the sticks. You light the match. The combustibles are the images from scripture and from the life of the world today, stacked piece by piece, from which the fire-builder creates what it means to be a person of faith in that moment.

Part 4. STRUCTURE MATTERS

As a Lutheran, I am trained to think of faith in the objective mode: that God imparts the faith of Jesus to us in baptism. That means I never have perfect faith, and I do not have to generate certain “feelings” in order to know that I have a relationship to God, to God’s people, to the church, to my neighbors, and to eternity. I find this comforting. But I also give thanks that being called or drawn to these relationships—that both challenge and comfort—engages me emotionally. There is joy over expressions of love, and horror at injustice, and all of that is found in God’s word, fed to me day after day.

I may think my emotional responses are imposed on me from outside myself by what I encounter, and that I am, therefore, at the mercy of what hits me. We have been given to think that is how emotions are built. But Harvard psychology professor Lisa Barrett tells us it is the other way around. Her study, entitled *How Emotions are Made*, says that emotions are created by our brains.²² (Bear with me. This has huge implications for the goals and forms of preaching.)

The brain works hard, Barrett says, to make meaning of what we experience inside our bodies and outside. The brain creates our feelings. Emotions are not simply triggered; we build them, and we use all the tools we can muster.

Barrett describes the brain as 85 billion neurons each wired to 10,000 other neurons.²³ Here is her description of the brain work we engage in all day long: “Your brain continually predicts and simulates all the sensory inputs from inside and outside your body, so it understands what they mean and what to do about them.”²⁴ Barrett is blunt.

You feel what your brain believes. Affect primarily comes from prediction . . . [Y]ou see what your brain believes—that’s affective realism . . . The same is true for most feelings you’ve experienced in your life. Even the feeling of the pulse in your wrist is a simulation, constructed in sensory regions of your brain and corrected by sensory input (your actual pulse). Everything you feel is based on prediction from your knowledge and past experience. You are truly an architect of your experience. Believing is feeling.²⁵

As an example, she tells a story about a time in graduate school when she was asked out for lunch by a fellow student. She initially categorized her emotional response to him as infatuation. Later she realized that her reaction was the flu.²⁶ The brain is constantly monitoring what the body experiences—what the brain has previously categorized—and constantly recategorizing when new experience requires it.

Preaching needs to take account of this meaning-creation—this feeling-creation—by recognizing that the brain of each listener is going to take in what it is given, put that together with its previous calculations, and generate new responses.²⁷ The brain’s work on meaning-construction starts with categorization: how things are perceived to be related. We are constantly upgrading our understanding of what belongs with what.

Barrett tells us that babies have been shown to group disparate objects together when a word is used to describe them all. These objects could be as dissimilar as a banana, a toy truck, and a spoon, but if they are called, for example, a “wug,” the baby knows they are together in the category of “wug.” She writes, “When we, as adults, speak a word to a child, an act of great significance takes place without fanfare. In that moment, we offer the child a tool to expand reality—a similarity that is purely mental—and she incorporates it into the patterns that are being laid

down inside her own brain for future use.” In short, “we hand her the tools to make and perceive emotions.”²⁸ Barrett describes this brain work as a great drama.

Emotion words are not about emotional facts in the world that are stored like static files in your brain. They reflect the varied emotional meanings you construct from mere physical signals in the world using your emotion knowledge . . . acquired . . . in part, from the collective knowledge contained in the brains of those who cared for you, talked to you, and helped you to create your social world. Emotions are not reactions *to* the world; they are your constructions *of* the world.²⁹

Here is the key, then, for preaching: Words set next to each other offer the brain opportunities to make creative new categories. Multiple words create optional, expansive realities. Images brought together into a single portrait—by being compared with each other, or simply placed alongside—sow seed in the brain with material from which to construct emotion.

How does preaching sow the needed seeds? Or to continue the fire metaphor: How does preaching lay the wood for the fire?

When Danish homiletician Marianne Gaarden studied how people listen to a sermon, she discovered that what people hear validates what any preacher well knows: individuals in the assembly generally do not hear what the preacher intends.³⁰ Something other than what the preacher built is being constructed by the listener. Gaarden calls it The Third Room. You can only build your own Third Room, as a listener; the preacher can’t build it for you.

Although the preacher cannot build the Third Room for others, the preacher has a responsibility to the Third Room. The preacher’s job is to be faithful to a vision, an honesty, and a hope for reconciliation, even redemption to shape the sermon. The preacher’s job is to give the listeners pieces of combustible material laid alongside one another—images from the scriptures and their own lives, the pain and beauty of the world—in ways that the preacher discerns might open the Third Rooms of *these people* to the fire of love. This is a very open-ended notion of the preservation of fire.

I believe this Third Room aligns well with the construction of meaning described by the early twentieth-century philosopher Charles Sanders Peirce. In his description of how we create meaning, we face at least two things. We are confronted by the potential for an encounter and by the fact of something we must attend to. Peirce called it a “brute fact” which is something that hits you so that you have to notice. Out of those two things, you work to understand what inevitability, what principle, lies behind them.

Case in point: Brute is what I experienced the day I pulled up to church last spring right across a four-lane road from the university. (This is a small city of about

20,000 people in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan.) I was about to step out of my little blue mini cooper, when a bear came around the corner of the church toward me. I quietly closed my car door and sat very still. Nobody else was around, although cars were parked between the bear and me. It was a small-ish bear (maybe twice my size) so I looked for a mama bear nearby. I saw no mama. The bear ambled across the parking lot before slipping between two houses and then back into the maple forests that abound in the north country.

Peirce would say there are three parts to this event. Reality is made up of triads. He gave them obvious but weird names: First, Second, and Third. They carry qualities he called Firstness, Secondness, and Thirdness.

A First is unseen, veiled, because it is a potentiality. Something might happen but it hasn't happened yet. In the rural world where I live, there is always the potential for a bear to appear. What drove the bear to the church—the reason for its appearance, the impetus—was, again, a First. Perhaps the bear was hungry. Or lost. A bear without a compass. A lone bear on a busy Michigan roadway lumbering toward a quieter avenue.

A Second is the moment the bear came around the corner. A Second is a brute fact, the unveiling of the thing that was previously veiled as a First, as a potentiality. "Brute" because it commands your attention. "Fact" because you cannot dispute its reality. Brute can be a baseball bat hitting a fast ball, flood waters, a cool drink, a heartache, bread. A Second is an actuality, something seen, an object, matter. Brute does not have to be a bat or a bear, however. Brute can be a word, an actual sound, a vibration smack in your ear or cutting to your heart. A word as a symbol of the thing it represents so that it both is and is not actually that thing.

From this potentiality and then an actuality arises a Third. This is the over-riding generality to be derived from a brute fact. In my encounter with the bear, the generality, the Third, was the rule called THIS IS DANGER. When you are faced with a bear, the principle of the event is "be afraid." I didn't care that I would be late for my meeting. If you see a bear, the rule is: DO NOT MOVE.

My brain took in the moment by combining many bits of knowledge and of emotions and coming to understand its meaning. On a number of past occasions, I had been unable to sleep in the forest—in a tent—for fear of being eaten by a bear. I have memory in my bones of that fear. And I also remember my awe at watching a grizzly bear (from a safe distance) having a snack in Yellowstone Park—the great hump on its back, gleaming silver in the sunlight as it chowed down in the brush.

To recap: A First is the beginning. A Second is an outcome of that nascent possibility. And the Third is the general law or principle that moves the potential and the actual into becoming meaningful. This is not a linear progression. It is, like the *perichoresis* of the Holy Trinity, a dance that creates the world we actually live

in. Out of two, comes a Third Thing. Peirce called that Third Thing the interpretant—the interpretation of what is experienced. To me this sounds like Marianne Gaarden’s Third Room. Meaning comes from the brain’s engagement with images, memories, physical reactions, impressions, and inklings.

What is possible (Firstness) opens up to what is actual (Secondness) and establishes over-arching principles or one’s construction of reality itself (Thirdness).³¹ The three together constitute a sign that is always being constructed, never fixed. For Peirce, “a sign is essentially a medium between two correlates which it brings into connection with each other.”³² A sign’s meaning, in other words, is in the impulse to translate the sign into a new sign.³³ God’s word preached always draws the hearer into a new reality constructed by that hearer, from what is possible, what is spoken, and what generates yet another. Christians may think of it this way:

- A First is God’s promise of salvation come to us as unseen qualities (say, oxygen).
- A Second is a brute fact, a word—or the communion bread and the cup (the unveiled savior) actually placed in our hands (combustible fuel).
- A Third, then, is Jesus’ presence connecting the First and Second, the infinite continuity that governs future encounters with Word and the sacraments (the spark that ignites fire from oxygen and fuel).

As a liturgical scholar, I find it most promising that, according to Peirce, the Third is the means by which the First and Second are connected. The First, as I said, is the inkling, the faster-than-an-eye-blink sense that Something might be going to happen. And then it does happen and the Second, the experience itself, is the end. This places liturgy (the actual experience of gathering in worship) in the part of reality’s construction that is the end, the goal. We have already said that the communion bread is a Second, the actual presence of God-with us—whom we recognize and receive as such—for healing and conversion and transformation in the experience of Thirdness. The liturgy itself, then, also is a Second that gives rise to a Third for those with hearts for fire. Liturgy is the end for the means. It is the culmination of sheer feeling and thought.

The burning bush that called to Moses is a brute fact. It is a moment, a vision, a power that we still circle around, scrutinizing. It is nowhere to be found in the world, but it is in the world everywhere: the fire that did not turn the bush into ashes. The cross of Jesus’ crucifixion is a brute fact because it is a power in the world that confronts us just as does the voice in the burning bush. It is nowhere yet everywhere—and, even amidst all the crucifixions of and in the world, so too even more is Jesus’ empty tomb. We see this bush, this cross and open grave, and not being easily reconciled, we stretch to make a Third thing out of them. God’s Word plants these images in us. In response, we construct a world and a resonant emotion that compels us to keep circling and listening. We live with discrepancies

by engaging them in order to see in a new way, to imagine a different world, a different self.

Out of “at least two things” emerges a Third to tie them together. At least two things, as Gordon Lathrop has said over and over until we might finally hear that *ordo* is not a list; *ordo* is juncture—the space between the two.³⁴ We gain a reality that had not existed before: a rupture, something ripped through our sense of how things are—not just a new idea pasted onto what we had before, but something acquired by our being compelled to crawl through a chink between two surfaces.

Although we cannot give our pain away, what we have come to believe we believe can be taken from us.

CONCLUSION

The preacher’s job is to change the vision that we breathe in from our cultural experiences or from personal delusions, to open minds and hearts with multiple words. The preacher lets the images (as brute facts) confront the prejudices that we cling to when we are afraid to try on another option. The preacher lays the combustible images of scripture and world alongside the listener’s construction of reality, and the Holy Spirit sparks new fire. Think of the Easter Vigil’s new fire, a new hearth to fashion new beings alive in the dark.

Preaching that is intent on preserving the fire of tradition abolishes fear by giving permission to imagine living a fearless life, standing on firm ground. The liturgy is the architecture, the infrastructure, that provides a hearth suitable for preserving the fire of life.

I had the image one day of a sermon being something like a little bird, stunned from crashing into the living room window of the listeners’ lives. In my hands, I feel the fragile, dependent bones, the soft wings, and I watch it pant for life in the presence of all the study and prayer that goes into constructing a focus for the assembly on a given day, in that liturgical time, with those readings from God’s word.

The sermon is the little bird the preacher offers, not sure whether our sisters and brothers will tenderly cradle our words or not, whether they will see the Third Room. That is also true of our seminar conversations and our worship together over these days. I hope that we will all be nourished in many ways.

Thank you for the opportunity to share these thoughts.³⁵ Peace be with you.

Notes

1. Pope Francis, *Evangelii Gaudium* [*The Joy of the Gospel*], ¶ 28, http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/apost_exhortations/documents/papa-francesco_esortazione-ap_20131124_evangelii-gaudium.html#II.%E2%80%82The_homily.
2. A friend of mine, who is the St. Paul Chamber Orchestra librarian in Minnesota, could not verify Mahler's authorship, but the idea stands on its own as a compelling and haunting assertion.
3. See <http://science.howstuffworks.com/environmental/earth/geophysics/fire.htm>.
4. Thanks to Dr. Lisa Dahill's reminder of the relationship between fire and the human brain. See Richard Wrangham, *Catching Fire: How Cooking Made Us Human* (London: Profile Books, 2009).
5. Cara De Silva, ed., *In Memory's Kitchen: A Legacy from the Women of Terezin*, trans. Binca Steiner Brown (Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, 1996).
6. Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*, trans., D. W. Robertson, Jr. (Upper Saddle, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1958), 1.36, ¶ 40, p. 30.
7. *Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests*, #4; see also Constitution of the Sacred Liturgy, #35, 2.
8. U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Fulfilled in Our Hearing* (Washington DC: USCCB, 1970), 19, <http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/vocations/priesthood/priestly-life-and-ministry/upload/fiyh.pdf>.
9. John F. Baldovin, SJ, "Biblical Preaching in the Liturgy," *Studia Liturgica* 22 (1992): 112. See Yves Congar, "Sacramental Worship and Preaching," *Concilium* 33, cited in Karl Rahner, ed., *The Renewal of Preaching: Theory and Practice* (New York: Paulist Press, 1968).
10. Fred Craddock, *As One Without Authority* (St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press, 1971).
11. Eugene Lowry, *The Homiletical Plot* (Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press, 1980).
12. Lucy Rose, *Sharing the Word: Preaching in the Roundtable Church* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1997).
13. Henry H. Mitchell, *Celebration & Experience in Preaching* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1990), 11.
14. *Ibid.*, 82.
15. Luke A. Powery, *Spirit Speech: Lament and Celebration in Preaching* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2009), 133-135. The difficulty of naming racial and ethnic approaches to preaching and to liturgy is exemplified in his reference to "African American Christianities" (plural).
16. Linda Clader, *Voicing the Vision: Imagination and Prophetic Preaching* (Harrisburg, PA: Morehouse, 2003), 146-147.
17. Sally Brown, *Cross Talk: Preaching Redemption Here and Now* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2008), 48.
18. Paul Scott Wilson, *The Four Pages of the Sermon* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1999).
19. Stanley Hauerwas, "Preaching as Though We had Enemies," *First Things* 53 (May 1995).
20. Pope Francis, *Evangelii Gaudium*, II.143-144. Also ¶ 139: "The people of God, by the constant inner working of the Holy Spirit, is constantly evangelizing itself . . . Christian preaching thus finds in the heart of people and their culture a source of living water, which helps the preacher to know what must be said and how to say it."
21. Preachers regularly employ scripture, reason, experience, and tradition.
22. Lisa Feldman Barrett, *How Emotions are Made: The Secret Life of the Brain* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2017).
23. Ben Dicksenson, "You're More in Control of Your Emotions than you Think (Says New Brain Science)," *Elle*, 17 February 2017, elle.com.
24. Barrett, 151.
25. *Ibid.*, 78.
26. *Ibid.*, 111.
27. This could be manipulative. History gives us horrifying examples of mass deception: feeding the public twisted versions of reality in order to attain compliance. This is not what responsible preaching is about, of course.

28. Barrett, 98-99.
29. Ibid., 104.
30. Marianne Gaarden, *The Third Room of Preaching: The Sermon, the Listener, and the Creation of Meaning* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2017), Intro.
31. Peirce wrote, “The meaning of a sign is the sign it has to be translated into.” James Feibleman, *An Introduction to Peirce’s Philosophy: Interpreted as a System* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1946), 129-130, quoting Charles Sanders Peirce, *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*, ed. Charles Hartshorne and Paul Weiss (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1931-1935), 4.132.
32. C. S. Peirce, “Letter of Charles Sanders Peirce to Signor Papini,” in *A Thief of Peirce: The Letters of Kenneth Laine Ketner and Walker Percy*, ed. Patrick H. Samway, SJ (Jackson: Univ. Press of Mississippi, 1995), 286-287.
33. Melinda Quivik, “The Beautiful Funeral,” PhD diss., Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, CA, 2003, p. 242.
34. Gordon W. Lathrop, *Holy Things* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993).
35. I am indebted to colleagues, friends, and family who heard and read this paper in process and offered excellent support and incisive insights: Fredric L. Quivik, Anne Beffel, Jennifer Lord, Lisa Dahill, Christina Norland, Peter Norland, and Hank Langknecht.

Introduction of the *Berakah* Recipient

*Janet Walton and Cynthia Wilson
Delivered by David Gambrell,
Myung Sil Kim, and Cynthia Wilson*

Ruth Duck: Faithful Christian

“We are called to be resurrection people living into God’s future” . . . writes Ruth Duck, “responsible to hand on the word of life.” And responsible she is! Ruth Duck is a persistent, undaunted and wholehearted witness to a vital faith. Through hundreds and hundreds of songs, often scripture texts reworded to meet current yearnings, she invites communities to hear the possibilities of hope, no matter what the situation, and to sing us into action.

Ruth Duck: Pastor/Teacher/Mentor/Friend

I (Cynthia Wilson) was introduced to this phenomenal woman through the fabulous voice of Oleta Adams. Tears streamed down my face as Oleta sang: “Wash, O God, Our Sons and Daughters, where your cleansing waters flow, number them among your people, bless as Christ blessed long ago.” I could never have imagined sitting at the feet of Ruth C. Duck in the flesh!

Her daily mantra to us as students was, “In addition to the voice you bring to seminary, we must find your voice as 21st Century Liturgical Scholar!”

Ruth, I never told you this, but until I met you, I never knew there was a place in the academy for voices like mine. Thank you!

Ruth Duck: Composer and Creator of Texts and Tunes

In the 1970’s, forty-seven years ago, when Ruth was a campus minister and a pastor she began the long, difficult journey to challenge the limits of the theological and human language communities used in their worship. What moved her then and now is her conviction that singing hymns provides avenues to express what we know deep within, but may have never spoken. In every decade of her career, in every place and for every emerging need, with generosity and courage, Ruth writes a hymn. With her texts and tunes she opens hearts and minds to act on behalf of one another.

Ruth Duck: Theologian: Feminist/Womanist/Mujerista/Spirit of Han

In particular, Ruth has led women from every background and culture to name

what is true for them, words that connect their day to day realities with names for God, tunes that express women's suffering, that urge women's courage. In such a time as this one, when the realities of sexual harassment are writ large, Ruth has just the right hymn for this moment. The text includes: "Sister, Wisdom, come assist us, Spirit guide and close companion bring to light our sacred worth."

Ruth Duck: Global Citizen

In her most recent textbook, *Worship for the Whole People of God: Vital Worship for the 21st Century*, Dr. Duck celebrates the unique forms of worship from the African-American, Asian, Euro-American cultures. She emphatically declares: "Prayer, anointing, song and witness, 'that justice may roll down like water and righteousness like an ever-flowing stream' (Amos 5:24), need not be confined to church buildings. Our worship and witness to God's love and justice belong on the street, where the people are."

Ruth Duck: The Poetry of Grace

Ruth's deep commitment to expansive language, to diverse images and names for God are beautifully articulated in her newly released song collection, *The Poetry of Grace*.

As we close, we felt that there would be no better way to end this portion of our tribute than by praying this Ruth Duck text that fitly represents the ethos and pathos of her theology, ecclesiology, and ultimate hope for the church and the world. Please join us in singing *Diverse in Culture, Nation, Race*.

*"Diverse in culture, nation race, we come together by Your grace.
God, let us be a meeting ground where hope and healing love are found.*

*God, let us be a bridge of care connecting people everywhere.
Help us confront all fear and hate and lust for power that separate.*

*When chasms widen, storms arise, O Holy Spirit, make us wise.
Let our resolve, like steel, be strong to stand with those who suffer wrong.*

*God, let us be a table spread with gifts of love and broken bread,
where all find welcome, grace attends, and enemies arise as friends."*¹

Friends, tonight we celebrate! We salute! We say "Thanks be to God!" for Ruth C. Duck!

Note

1. Ruth C. Duck, "Diverse in Culture, Nation, Race" in *The Poetry of Grace* (Carol Stream, IL: Hope Publishing, 2015)

**The North American
Academy of Liturgy**

The 2018 Berakah Award

Presented to

Ruth C. Duck

*Distinguished poet,
Beloved teacher,
Generous colleague'
Faithful ecumenical friend,*

*You have graced assemblies with words that sing
across generations, cultures and church traditions.
You have challenged us to think deeply about worship
with wideness of mercy and knowledge of the heart.*

*For your decades of tireless, compassionate teaching
and unassuming presence in our midst,
for these gifts so lavishly given,
we give thanks to God on behalf of this academy.*



Berakah Response

The Open Table of the World

Ruth C. Duck

I am amazed to receive the *Berakah* Award, grateful beyond words to be counted among those who have received this award in the past, and thankful for so many gifted colleagues who have not yet received this honor. Special thanks to President Jennifer Lord for her guidance in preparation. Also, my thanks to Ruth Meyers, who invited me to speak at the Church Divinity School of the Pacific where I chose to do a version of tonight's address. Her formal response to my talk was wise and helpful to me as I prepared for tonight. Thanks also to Chelsea Yarborough, another NAAL member, for allowing me to share her ideas. Time does not allow me to thank all of you who have been helpful to me over the years!

I am wearing my hanbok (Korean clothing), because of its beauty and its reminder of the great gift it has been to work and teach among colleagues and students from many backgrounds. It was a gift from Myung Sil Kim, one of my former doctoral advisees, who now teaches in Korea. I am glad she is with us at this meeting.

My topic, "The Open Table of the World," grows from my fascination with people who are expressing their faith in public—offering ashes on train platforms; protesting water misuse in Starving Rock and Detroit; singing, praying, or celebrating communion on the streets. Young adult Christians particularly seem to be drawn to these expressions of faith. I have been collecting stories and wondering what would mean for Christians and other people of faith to live sacramentally in public—sharing a table open to all and engaging a lifetime journey to which God calls us. I am inspired by Isaiah, who pictured a great banquet of plenty, honor, and love, a banquet God will spread for all peoples, not just for some, and not meager but abundant. Here it is in the Ruth Duck not-so-standard version:

⁶ On this mountain the Blessed One will make for all peoples
a feast of rich food, a feast of well-aged wines,
of rich food filled with marrow, of well-aged wines strained clear.

⁷ And the Holy One will destroy on this mountain
the shroud that is cast over all peoples,
the sheet that is spread over all nations,

⁸ and God will swallow up death forever. Then the God of compassion will

wipe away tears from all faces, and take away the disgrace of those who have been abused or rejected or hungry, for the Almighty has spoken.

In these days when a shroud of senseless violence is over all people,
and many lack enough food, enough justice, and enough honor,
Isaiah gives us a vision of God spreading a table that is open to all peoples.

Perhaps Jesus was thinking of Isaiah when he said, “When you host a meal, do not invite your friends or relatives or rich neighbors, in case they may invite you in return, and you would be repaid. But when you give a banquet, invite people who cannot repay you. For you will be repaid at the resurrection of the righteous” (Luke 14: 12-24). Hmm . . . food for thought! . . . a lot of time to wait for our reward . . .

In this parable nothing is quid pro quo—grace is free. And there is good evidence that the earliest church ate together and shared their food. In Acts we read that they spent time together daily, eating food with glad and generous hearts (Acts 2: 43-47). In fact, the community created the role of deacons to care for widows who were neglected in the daily food distribution (Acts 7). And Paul upheld justice at the table when charging the church at Corinth with not sharing food fairly. “For when the time comes to eat, each of you goes ahead with your own supper. One goes hungry and another becomes drunk” (1 Cor. 18-33). Paul sees Eucharist as a place where all will be filled.

David Owens, pastor for some years at the United Church of Christ congregation I attended in Illinois, wrote this invitation to the open table which we have often used through many years.

This is the table of God, the joyful host.
Everyone, child, youth, and adult,
is welcome to eat at this table.
No matter what your religious affiliation,
no matter what your particular beliefs or nagging doubts may be,
you are welcome to share in this meal.
With the boldness of Jesus we invite everyone:
Come and joyfully share!

At this table all differences are put aside,
and we share in the glory of our common humanity,
anticipating that day when all God’s creation will dwell together
in harmony, prosperity, and peace.¹

Some years ago I presided at the marriage of two women. No church in town would welcome them for their ceremony, so we met in a local park facility. The

service started with David's wonderful words of welcome. Joy and laughter filled the room, continuing through the banquet where people from many backgrounds and beliefs feasted together. Goes to show that God's open table doesn't happen only in church buildings.

Just Hospitality and Worship in Multicultural Congregations

Certainly one aspect of setting an open table is developing true hospitality among people of various cultural backgrounds. It has become more and more clear to me during my years teaching courses on worship and liturgy that a paradigm shift is needed: the traditions of continental Europe and Great Britain, as well as white Protestant services in the United States, should not be treated as the only measure of adequate liturgy and worship. This paradigm shift can picture diverse Christian communities worshipping God, without privileging one group over the other, like the great multitude envisioned in Revelation 7:9 "that no one could count, from all tribes and peoples and languages, standing before the throne and before the Lamb, robed in white, with palm branches in their hands," crying out in a loud voice and saying, "Salvation belongs to our God!" What a lovely image of sharing worship and praise expressed in many languages and customs.

For several years, much effort has been put into nurturing intercultural worship. Some very helpful ideas have been surfacing. Chelsea Brooke Yarborough, a doctoral student in Religion, Homiletics, and Liturgics, at Vanderbilt University, has articulated some new and important ways of approaching multicultural worship. She notes that

Worship that lacks diversity in a congregation that is diverse is simply not inconvenient or not at its best. It is violently inhospitable to individuals that already experience marginalization in the larger society. Multicultural worship without a commitment to *just hospitality* is dangerous.²

Her word *just* is essential. To be friendly is not only to welcome newcomers. To sing one song *once* in the language of some in a diverse congregation, or to bring in a visiting gospel choir once a year is not *just multicultural worship*—if white privilege is still predominant.³ Worship is certainly not *just* if people of color in the congregation do not have a voice in shaping services, while the liturgical tastes of white members are the main course of *so-called* "multicultural worship." Chelsea has experienced this often, but she's taken part in two services that reflected diverse participants throughout worship. She wrote:

They each offered a worshipping environment that intentionally displayed a multiplicity of racial identities in each of the services. In those spaces I encountered a God present in my tradition but not bound by it. I witnessed a Spirit that showed up in my Black Baptist and Pentecostal worship and that showed up equally in the white Presbyterian liturgy . . . As a result of these experiences I seek to explore the ways that multicultural worship can be a space of God's welcome for all and not just the white majority.⁴

She also noted that deeper levels of conversation among diverse groups is essential in moving forward, especially among worship committees and planners, so that the dominant majority can understand the realities of racial identity and alienation in the wider culture. I encountered similar ideas from Professor Michal Eric Dyson in his recent book, *Tears We Cannot Stop: A Sermon to White America* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2017). He, too, asks for honest conversations about white privilege, racism, and justice. He draws on his life experiences and calls for more engagement in truth telling about issues of race. Likewise, Leah Gunning Francis, academic dean at Christian Theological Seminary, in her book *Ferguson & Faith* (St. Louis, Missouri: Chalice Press, 2015), urges people of faith to educate themselves about black life and culture, the history of slavery, and the civil rights movement. She also encourages white people to worship with African Americans, and participate in protests and local meetings. Such ways of engagement can build bridges, as we gain more understanding of others' lives, struggles, gifts and joys.⁵

Sharing at the Open Table calls us to move past "the temple of our familiar," to call on a book title by Alice Walker.⁶ When Jesus prepared the disciples for ministry, he didn't gather them in a comfortable synagogue, put up signs, and wait for people to come inside. He prepared them to go out into the world and gave them power and authority to proclaim the reign of God and to heal—in other words, to join God's mission. Ruth Meyers notes that "new perspectives on mission have emerged in many churches, emphasizing a theological understanding of mission."⁷ For example, South African theologian David Bosch wrote: "[Mission] is . . . not primarily an activity of the church, but an attribute of God . . . Mission is thereby a movement from God to the world."⁸

Worship services can support that movement. One aspect of worship and preaching is to consider what is happening in the world and reflect on ministry we are doing in response. Stephanie VanSlyke, our colleague at NAAL and my pastor for many years (until I recently relocated to California), is able to connect wisely the scripture readings, what is happening in the world, and our work of compassion and justice. In the words of Linda and Dwight Vogel, as we gather to worship, we are learning to live sacramentally.⁹

Baptism is not a one-time event—it is also dying and rising with Christ in love for the world through the gift of the Spirit; it means belonging to a people. This is a life-time journey. In baptism (using words from the United Methodist service) "we accept the freedom and power God gives us to resist evil, injustice, and oppression, in whatever forms they present themselves."¹⁰ Living out our baptisms, we need community, that we may support one another to turn away from violence, prejudice, and corruption, and turn toward justice, peace, and integrity.

In the sacrament of the table we remember Jesus, thank God, and call upon the Spirit. Eating together we commune with God and one another. and learn to discern

the Holy One's presence in daily life and all our meals. Sharing at table can deepen community within and beyond places of worship as we share abundantly and participate in God's promised reign. So I want to tell three stories about witness in the world, the stories of ordinary people who expressed their faith in public spaces.

St Gregory of Nyssa Church, San Francisco

You may know the story of Sara Miles. She worked first as a cook in New York; then she labored for justice in Central America. Later, in the face of devastating violence, she returned to the United States, settling in San Francisco. One Sunday she wandered into St. Gregory of Nyssa Episcopal Church and was amazed at people surrounding a big table. A parishioner said, "Jesus invites everyone to his table." She continues: "And then we gathered around that table. And there was more singing and standing, and someone was putting a piece of fresh, crumbly bread in my hands, saying 'the body of Christ,' and handing me the goblet of sweet wine, saying, 'the blood of Christ,' and then something outrageous and terrifying happened. Jesus happened to me."¹¹

It took time for her to make sense of her new experiences, but she came to discover her call. San Francisco was "foodie heaven, . . . but access to food varied drastically by neighborhood."¹² Healthy food was much less available than liquor and chips. She learned about hunger in areas near her home in projects with people crowded into tiny apartments. Then she discovered the San Francisco Food Bank and was inspired to begin a food pantry at St. Gregory's. Today many volunteers are involved; Miles continues to cook and serve weekly.¹³ She writes: "Because of how I've been welcomed and fed in the Eucharist, I see starting a food pantry not as an act of 'outreach,' but one of gratitude. To feed others means acknowledging our own hunger and at the same time acknowledging the amazing abundance we're fed with by God."¹⁴

Protests in Ferguson, Missouri

Protests in Ferguson were marked by rituals. Protesters arrayed stuffed animals and flowers on the spot where Michael Brown was killed while running away from a police officer.¹⁵ Police repeatedly removed this memorial until protest leaders decided to take it down each night and put it out again every morning. Many religious leaders in the area and beyond joined the protest. They sought to support the young protesters by being present and building relationships with them, not to dominate. At a particularly tense time of interaction between police and protesters, the clergy knelt in prayer. The young justice seekers put their hands on the shoulders of the clergy, then kneeled with them. This moment of public ritual diffused the tension.

This movement changed many lives and churches in Ferguson. Congregations that had resisted their leaders joining demonstrations later offered safe space to protesters.¹⁶ Some white congregations began to understand their ministries (and their white privilege) in new ways. Many of them saw this work as a call from God.

One young participant said, “I think the clergy involvement has showed me that the church does not always have to exist within those four walls . . . We became church. People who had never prayed in years prayed that night on that police department lot.”¹⁷

Leah Gunning Francis wrote: “Clergy practices of prayer created an awakening to God in unlikely places. The ‘altars’ were moved out of the sanctuaries and onto the streets, where they challenged people to see, hear, and feel the presence of God in the midst of protests.”¹⁸ Some began to see the gatherings in Ferguson as joining at a table. Jacquelyn Foster, a pastor in the St. Louis area, reflected: “I . . . saw hope there: hope for a different future; hope that black lives would matter; hope that the killing of . . . black people and particularly young black men would not just be accepted as the way it is.” She said that when the congregation gathers as a Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) to have communion every Sunday “they often speak of setting the table in the streets.” She said: “When we set the table in the streets and everybody is welcome, that’s the kingdom of God. That’s the reign of God. That’s the culture of God.”¹⁹

Recently I met Mark Johnson, a leader in the Fellowship of Reconciliation. Part of their work has been to diffuse tension in difficult situations, calling on rituals of faith traditions. One group among the fellowship lives in community with one another working together as Muslims, Jews, and Christians.

Anointing and Prayer as Public Rituals

Recently, some have taken ancient liturgical practices of prayer and anointing to the streets. For example, some anointed the Department of Justice building in St. Louis until the building glistened, then anointed one another.

In Evanston, Illinois, a remarkable ministry of anointing and prayer happened from 2013-2015. A student at Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary and a leader in a nearby Baptist Church, Brian Smith, who became concerned about shootings in the Fifth Ward of the city, a predominantly African American neighborhood. He went to a community meeting, prepared just to listen to people’s concerns. Senior citizens were concerned about their safety. Albert Gibbs stood up and said, “Where’s God in this?” After the meeting Smith and Gibbs spoke. They decided to meet the next Saturday morning to anoint the block where a shooting had recently occurred. In two years and one hundred and twenty different locations they anointed and prayed over every block in the ward, often praying over individual homes. They anointed all schools in the area, including Evanston High School, Garrett-Evangelical, and Northwestern University, and prayed for faculty and staff at each school.

When two drug dealers rented a house in the Fifth Ward, Smith and Gibbs prayed over the house and the people. Their prayers were answered when these dealers

left the neighborhood. Beth Emet Synagogue of Evanston invited Smith to preach on Hanukkah; then he led twenty members to anoint their building and the block surrounding them.

Later Brian and Albert felt called to take their ministry to the local police station. They let the police know that they were coming, lest it seem to be a demonstration. They were welcomed at the station, and went inside to anoint the officers, and then the police cars in the lot. Though in these times of high tension between police and people of color it was not easy, this gesture was a moment of reconciliation and prayer.

Rituals of anointing and prayer bathe these difficult times in the living water of God's love. As the poet Tennyson wrote, "More things are wrought by prayer than this world knows." Rituals, together with protests and transformative actions, contribute to the search for justice in this world. They bring us together around God's table of the world.

Notes

1. David Owens, in Ruth Duck and Maren Tirabassi, editors, *Touch Holiness: Resources for Worship, Updated* (Cleveland, Ohio: The Pilgrim Press, 2012), 160.
2. Chelsea Brooke Yarborough, "Prophetic or Problematic: Exploring the Potential of *Just* Multicultural Worship," *Proceedings of the North American Academy of Liturgy*, 2017: 166.
3. *Ibid.*, 168.
4. *Ibid.*, 171.
5. Leah Gunning Francis, Lecture at Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary, September 22, 2015.
6. Alice Walker, Title: *The Temple of My Familiar* (San Diego: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 1989).
7. Ruth Meyers, from "The Open Table of the World: A Response," November 2, 2017.
8. David J. Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1991), 390.
9. Dwight W. Vogel and Linda J. Vogel, *Sacramental Living: Falling Stars & Coloring Outside the Lines* (Nashville: TN, Upper Room Books, 1999).
10. *United Methodist Hymnal*, Baptismal Covenant I (Nashville: United Methodist Publishing House, 1989), 34.
11. Sara Miles, *Take This Bread* (New York: Ballantine Books, 2007), 57.
12. *Ibid.*, 58.
13. <https://www.saintgregorys.org/the-food-pantry.html>
14. *Ibid.*, 116.
15. Leah Gunning Francis, *Ferguson and Faith: Sparking Leadership and Awakening Community* (St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2015), 7.
16. *Ibid.*, 9-18.
17. *Ibid.*, 63.
18. *Ibid.*, 156.
19. *Ibid.*, 118.



Part 2

Seminar Reports

The Advent Project

Convener: Elise Feyerherm, Ph. D., Associate Rector at St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Brookline, MA. She was director of Anglican Formation at Bexley Hall Seminary in Columbus, OH (now Bexley Seabury Federation in Chicago, IL) until 2013 and has taught liturgy, church history, and spirituality at Bexley Seabury as well as at Episcopal Divinity School in Cambridge, MA. She is convener of the Music and Liturgy Commission of the Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts.

Members in Attendance: Elise Feyerherm, John Grabner, Richard Hamlin, William Petersen

Visitors in Attendance: Lisa Allen McLaurin

Description of Work

After hearing updates from members about their work during the past year, the seminar received two papers for discussion related to Scripture during the season of Advent: the first on the Book of Revelation and the second on the concept of "mishpat" (judgment and/or justice) in the Hebrew Scriptures. We reviewed seminar member Bill Petersen's new publication, *What Are We Waiting For? Re-Imagining Advent for Time to Come*, and collaborated on a survey instrument for evaluating parish experiences of a seven-week Advent.

Papers and Presentations

- Elise Feyerherm, "E'en so, Lord Jesus, quickly come: Reclaiming the book of Revelation for Advent worship and beyond."

Reflecting on the way in which Paul Manz's classic choral anthem "E'en so, Lord Jesus, quickly come" has introduced themes from Revelation into the Advent worship of congregations across denominations, Feyerherm makes the argument that Revelation, particularly the last two chapters in which the new heaven and new earth are depicted, ought to be more prominent in the Eucharistic lectionary during Advent. Crucial themes in Revelation include the call to the Church to resist earthly empire, stand with the oppressed, and participate in God's work of making all things new.

- Deborah Appler, "Judgment or Justice? The concept of Mishpat in Hebrew Scriptures"

Dr. Appler was unable to attend the meeting in Vancouver but submitted a copy of her paper, which was read aloud at the seminar.

A central theme of the season of Advent is the anticipation of Christ's return to judge the earth and bring justice. Appler's paper explores the Hebrew word "mishpat," which is translated into English as both *judgment* and *justice*, having to do with both issuing legal verdicts as well as maintaining the rights of all people. Although *mishpat* does carry both meanings in Hebrew, Appler reminds the reader that in the larger context of the Hebrew Bible, judgment is always meant to restore the dignity and wellbeing of those who are oppressed. Since the term *mishpat* appears throughout each year of a seven-week Advent season to some degree, understanding this concept rightly enables preachers to anchor their Advent messages in an expectation of the fullness of God's righteousness and justice for the oppressed.

- William H. Petersen, *What Are We Waiting For? Re-Imagining Advent for Time to Come* (New York, NY: Church Publishing, 2017).

The publication of this book, written by seminar founder and member Bill Petersen, stands as a high point for the Advent Project in 2017, bringing together in one volume the historical background, theological underpinnings, and liturgical rationale for re-imagining the season of Advent. Petersen begins with an exploration of the lectionary as well as the history of the liturgical season, drawing out the deeper message of Advent, which is not the birth of the infant Messiah but participation in the full manifestation of Christ's reign of justice, peace, and the integrity of creation. He proceeds to an analysis and critique of the secular Christmas culture and the Church's complicity in the materialism that is at the heart of that culture. As a solution, Petersen proposes a seven-week Advent season that begins shortly after the feast of All Saints on November 1, each Sunday of the season celebrating Christ as Messiah through the lens of the seven "O" Antiphons (traditionally sung as refrains with the Magnificat at Vespers from December 18-24, but in this schema stretched out to encompass the entire seven-week season).

Seminar convener Elise Feyerherm is in conversation with Nancy Bryan at Church Publishing about producing a devotional companion to *What Are We Waiting For?* This will provide resources for personal and communal prayer during a seven-week Advent season; anticipated publication will be autumn of 2019.

- Developing a reporting and evaluative online survey for congregations observing a seven-week Advent

Seminar member Dick Hamlin sketched out a questionnaire for gathering information as well as to help us develop new resources. Questions cover a variety of topics: how a congregation used the lectionary; what Advent Project resources were used and what additional resources might be helpful; whether an Advent wreath was employed and if so, how it was redesigned; and how the congregation and its liturgical leaders were prepared to engage in a re-imagined Advent. Most important is the question: what did you learn?

Other Work and Plans

We continue to work on developing a new website for the Advent Project. It is also our goal this year to compile a full list of congregations currently observing an expanded Advent and be in regular contact with them; their experience and imagination are vital to the ongoing work of the Advent Project. Topics to be explored at future annual meetings of the NAAL include: creation imagery during Advent and its connection to Christ as Sapientia; Jewish and Christian understandings of “Messiah”; cultivating musicians and developing additional music for Advent; the Hebrew concept of “shalom” in the Advent lectionary.

Christian Initiation

Convener: Diana Dudoit Raiche, Assistant Professor, Neuhoﬀ School of Ministry, University of Dallas

Members in Attendance: David Batchelder, Daniel Benedict, Robert Brooks, Lawrence Mick, Catherine Vincie; Vicky Tufano; Paul Turner, Catherine Vincie, Steve Wilbricht

Visitors in Attendance: Christina (Christy) Condyles, Sandra DeMas, Timothy Gabrielli, Byron Hansen, Gregor Sneddon

The Christian Initiation Seminar asks questions that stand at the intersection of the classic ordo for Christian Initiation and the ongoing formation of the church. For example: What is the vision for the church inherent within these rites? How is that intention both supported and resisted by the church? What historical sources inform us?

Description of Work

Following introductions, the work of the Christian Initiation Seminar began with a summary report from Vicky Tufano, senior editor at Liturgy Training Publications, on the National Gathering on Christian Initiation that was sponsored by Liturgy Training Publications, July 2017. Conversation followed regarding training that is occurring in multiple traditions and the conference for catechumenal ministers and pastoral leaders July 5-6, 2018, in Chicago, IL.

Papers and Presentations

- At the first afternoon session Paul Turner, pastor of Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception in Kansas City, Missouri and director of the Office of Divine Worship for the Diocese of Kansas City-St. Joseph, presented on *Guide for Celebrating Christian Initiation with Adults* (Victoria M. Tufano, Paul Turner, D Todd Williamson), part of a series from Liturgy Training Publications on preparing for parish worship. He began with the rationale for his approach to the theology and history of the catechumenate in the introduction to this book. Starting the book with Christian Initiation General Introduction, he advances this as the source for the theology which serves to unify initiation of adults and children, the two categories of initiation. Drawing from his book *Ages of Initiation*, he retells the story of the sequence of the initiation in the early church. The book cites New Testament passages that pertain to this

history and traces anointing (confirmation) in the Syrian tradition, which has anointing preceding the baptism until the Council of Laodicea. Anointing as a value and sequence did not seem to make much difference. The variety of sequences from this early testimony calls into question the so-called “original sequence” of initiation. The administration of the initiation rites on a single occasion seemed more important than administering them in a unified sequence. Up to 1964 the Rite of Baptism for Children reduced in length the baptismal adult rite. The Consilium started meeting six weeks after *Sacro-sanctum Concilium* to work on the implementation of the catechumenate and other rites.

- David Batchelder, Pastor of West Plano Presbyterian Church in Plano, TX, followed with a presentation on his book, *Pathways to the Waters of Grace: A Guide for a Church's Ministry with Parents Seeking Baptism for their Children*. The book addresses the issue of baptismal integrity in the Presbyterian tradition, both with respect to pre-baptismal formation, as well as the rite of baptism itself, as one part of full initiation into the faith community. The underlying premise of the book is that how the church helps parents prepare for baptism, not only is vital to how the whole family lives its baptism identity throughout life, it is critical to the renewal of churches themselves. In its attempt to shift the norms of church ministry to an intensive and intentional preparation for baptism, the book takes its inspiration from the catechumenate for catechesis and formation. The book is written for those willing to get their feet wet in a process of sacramental formation that they, themselves, may not have experienced. It is eminently practical with all that is needed for leaders willing to experiment with a new form of pre-baptismal ministry.
- After the coffee break Timothy Gabrielli, Associate Professor of Theology, Seton Hall University, presented on his book, *Confirmation: How a Sacrament of God's Grace Became All about Us*. He explained that the project grew out of parish experience to address two questions: What are we doing in confirmation? How does it contribute to ongoing formation? The driving argument of the narrative is that the theology and practice of confirmation mirrors contemporary cultural shifts post *Quam Singulari*. Confirmation became “fair game” for how Roman Catholics relate to the wider culture: as a sacrament of Catholic Action; sacrament connected to the liturgical movement; sacrament for subcultures (of immigrants). As Catholic subculture devolved post-Vatican II, Confirmation evolved into a sacrament of maturity or commitment. Following that, confirmation became associated with the Catholic charismatic renewal and eventually a sacrament of choice in a pluralistic context. A “farewell” or “graduation” role of the sacrament that has developed has been lamented by many. How do we move forward? Emphasize the encounter with the Person of the Holy Spirit and the nature of Christian freedom based on the language in the rite: “Be Sealed with the Gift of the Holy Spirit.”
- Paul Turner followed with a presentation on his article “Conditional Baptism” published in *Worship*. He began with a historical reflection on the question

emerging in the 5th century dictum: Investigate and if you can't prove prior baptism, baptize conditionally. In other words, do your homework before deciding on a conditional baptism. The Roman Catholic tradition used to have a formula for conditional baptism, but it was dropped after Vatican II. We no longer have conditional formulas. When used, conditional baptism is not to be done publicly (solemnly), but rather privately. Current pastoral concerns pertain more to validity than to the fact of baptism. The 1983 Code of Canon Law was more responsive to ecumenical sensitivity. The CARA 2014 survey reports that 61% of parishes practiced conditional baptism in the previous year with 29 % occurring at the Easter Vigil and 2% at a Mass on Sunday.

- Our work on Saturday morning began with a presentation by Christina (Christy) Condyles, doctoral candidate in Liturgical Studies / Sacramental Theology at The Catholic University of America, on chapter three of her dissertation, "'Rights' of Christian Initiation: Manifesting Sacramental Grace in Daily Life through Divinized Nature" as well as an overview of her whole dissertation. Explaining that the term "rights" is more than a privilege, but that rights have responsibilities, as well as duties, she advanced the purpose of the chapter: to develop Christian identity as sacramental identity. It is a theological study of the sacraments with a focus on divinization and theosis, which puts Roman Catholic theology and Orthodox theology in dialogue while maintaining aspects of their own traditions. This is a starting point to discuss and develop the effects of sacraments for living through the process for divinization. Worship/liturgy is our response to God's gracious gifts. Sacraments have eternal consequences because a divinized human nature is only possible because of Christ.
- Steve Wilbricht, Associate Professor of Religious Studies, Stonehill College, Easton, MA, followed with a presentation on "What is 'Baptismal Ecclesiology'?", a chapter from a forthcoming book, *Baptismal Ecclesiology and the Order of Christian Funerals*. The premise of the book/chapter is that the community plays a prominent role in relation to the death of a baptized person. He contextualized the presentation with a reflection on death, based on a personal experience, that brought home the sense that death as a communal entry into the life of God was not included in funeral considerations. Rather, the personal convenience of individual family members was a primary consideration. The ecclesial nature of death in the early church was prominent with rituals that have now been supplanted/replaced by the funeral industry. Under Augustine's influence of Original Sin and the individual soul's journey, a previous experience of death as "holy sleep" with particular rituals has been lost/upended. The individual notion of death challenges an understanding of death as connected to our insertion into a Christian family, the Paschal Mystery, and eternal life. Highlighting a baptismal ecclesiology can help to remedy the cultural reality that "church" is no longer central/relevant to peoples' lives. The ecumenical sensitivity of the chapter pertains not only to the Order for Christian Funerals but also Christian initiation.

- After lunch Daniel Benedict, writer/consultant in Worship and Liturgical Prayer, StrongCenter/OpenDoors, Waialua, HI, shared a presentation on practical aspects of the catechumenal process to a multi-denominational protestant audience as an ecumenical introduction and training for the catechumenate. Functional language was used in place of classic language (catechumenate, election, etc.) to make the process more accessible and to avoid confusion. The small group gathering/discussion in this training model reflects the “watching-over-in-love” and accountability, as in Methodism. One of the cautions of the catechumenate is to avoid becoming step-by-step mechanical, but rather imbued with the reality that the Holy Spirit is active and calling us to God.

Other Work and Plans

Following these presentations and related discussions, seminar members generated a number of emerging questions to focus our work in the future. We discussed possible topics related to the emerging questions to facilitate interest in research and presentations for 2019-2020. It was also suggested we approach engagement with future topics in a manner that expands our understanding of core concepts rather than focusing immediately on particularities.

1. Steve Wilbricht will continue the discussion of baptismal ecclesiology with his completed book on this topic, *Baptismal Ecclesiology and the Order of Christian Funerals*.
2. Christina Condyles will present a second chapter from her dissertation *The “Rights” of Christian Initiation: Creating Identity and Being Divinized through Sacramental Participation*, that will be a springboard for a discussion on baptism around two questions: What does not being baptized mean? Why does baptism matter?
3. David Batchelder will address the ethical mandate of baptism around the question: What does baptism mean in a post-truth world? Related concepts include the meaning of renunciations, indiscriminate baptism, and the link between confession of faith and ethical considerations.
4. The seminar will focus on confirmation by engaging in a discussion of comparable rites for confirmation from several ecclesial traditions. Gregor Sneddon will send a bibliography of Anglican rites; David Batchelder will present what stands for confirmation in the new Presbyterian Book of Common Worship; Paul Turner will present on the new translation of the Order of Confirmation in the Roman Catholic tradition. A method for engaging in such discussion will be developed.
5. Catherine Vincie will address Scrutinies in relation to the baptism rites.
6. TBD: The Christian Initiation Seminar agreed to a possible joint session with the Liturgical Formation Seminar (Dr. Patty Hughes, convener) on restored order of initiation sacraments with the Archbishop of Denver, Samuel Joseph Aquila.

Critical Theories and Liturgical Studies

Convener: Rev. Kristine Suna-Koro is a diasporic Latvian-American theologian who currently works as Associate Professor of Theology at Xavier University, Cincinnati, OH. She is a pastor in the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (LELCA).

Members in Attendance: Kimberly Belcher, Layla Karst, Gerald Liu, Gabriel Pivarnik, Rebecca Spurrier, Kristine Suna-Koro, David Turnbloom

Visitors in Attendance: Kristen Daley Mosier, Cory Dixon, Sarah Johnson, Marie-Ange Rabotoniaina, Jason Smith.

Description of Work

The seminar opened with member updates and welcoming of the visitors. During the course of the meeting we had the opportunity to engage with three very erudite, timely, and stimulating papers.

Papers and Presentations

- David Turnbloom moderated the discussion panel on Andrew Prevot's recent monograph *Thinking Prayer: Theology and Spirituality Amid the Crises of Modernity* (University of Notre Dame Press, 2015). Following the introductory remarks by the moderator, seminar members focused on the connections between liturgy, doxology, ethics, aesthetics of revelation, suffering, and theodicy.
- Rebecca Spurrier presented her paper "Naming: Aesthetics of Healing and Claiming" focusing on the worship practices of people with disabilities based on her field research in Atlanta, GA. Led by the in-depth remarks by the respondent Layla Karst, the seminar engaged in a lively discussion on the ethics of "naming well" those for whom liturgical communities pray especially considering the role of worshippers with disabilities. The paper will form the core for one of the chapters in Rebecca's forthcoming book.
- Sarah K. Johnson presented her work on the diverse liturgical responses to the recent mass shootings in the U.S. Her paper "Ritual Responses to Gun Violence in American Schools" engendered a rich conversation led by the respondent Kim Belcher. The seminar discussed the ways how Christian liturgical resources have been appropriated as a matrix for public disaster rituals in the context of civil religion across various multicultural settings.
- Jason M. Smith presented a paper based on parts of his dissertation in prog-

ress, “Eucharist as the Gift of Political Language.” The paper offered a comparative analysis of the liturgical theology of Louis-Marie Chauvet and the ideas of Radical Orthodoxy as expressed in the work of John Milbank with a particular focus on the Eucharist as a political and ontological scandal. The respondent Gerald Liu offered a masterful analysis of the arguments regarding the constructive proposal in progress toward an apophatic political theology of the Eucharist. The whole seminar engaged in a vigorous conversation about the intersection of postmodern liturgical theology, Radical Orthodoxy, as well as the Anglican sacramental tradition in a broadly ecumenical framework.

Seminar members thanked the panel moderator, presenters, and responders for offering a dynamic, versatile and timely work. They also thanked our visitors for their interest in the seminar work and their contribution to the sessions with questions and comments. We congratulated Layla Karst upon becoming a member of NAAL.

Other Work and Plans

In conclusion of the seminar work, all present seminar members and visitors discussed the preliminary agenda for the 2019 annual meeting in Denver. After considering several options, the consensus emerged regarding the following topic: Liturgical Hospitality: Liturgical inclusion and exclusion. Layla Karst, Kim Belcher, Gerald Liu, Kristine Suna-Koro, and Gabriel Pivarnik committed to offering input in terms of papers of various length converging on our common theme. Rebecca Spurrier and Jason Smith committed to serve as responders. We invite all seminar members as well as visitors who might be interested in critically and constructively exploring liturgical hospitality to consider taking part in our seminar program next year in Denver!

Ecology and Liturgy

Convener: Benjamin M. Stewart, Associate Professor of Worship at The Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago

Members in Attendance: Lisa Dahill, Therese DeLisio, Marty Haugen, Mary McGann, Lawrence Mick, Ellen Oak, Paula Sampson, Susan Marie Smith, Benjamin M. Stewart, Samuel Torvend

Visitors in Attendance: Ron Berezan, founder of The Urban Farmer, Powell River, British Columbia, Brian Johnson

Description of Work

This seminar aims to explore the multiple ways in which ecological consciousness/practices and liturgical consciousness/practices intersect and contextualize each other, and to develop articles/resources on this topic for the use by scholars and practitioners of worship.

An introductory session reviewed our research since last year and received greetings from absent members, followed by a presentation by member Paula Sampson and guest Deacon Rob Berezan, founder of the Urban Farmer in Powell River, British Columbia, introducing the seminar to practices of liturgy and permaculture in the region. The three following sessions were each anchored by paper presentations including a joint book discussion session with Eucharistic Prayer and Theology Seminar and the Liturgical Language Seminar. We concluded with a discussion of future book studies, and the conclusion of the convener's second term at the end of the 2019 academy.

Papers and Presentations:

- Ron Berezan and Paula Sampson, "Permaculture and Liturgy in Powell River, BC"
- Samuel Torvend, "The Banquet of God's Vulnerable Creation"
- Lisa Dahill, "Living, Local, Wild Waters: Into Baptismal Reality"
- Marty Haugen, "Before the Universe Burst Forth in Light"
- Paul Galbreath, "Ecological Revisions in the *Book of Common Worship*"

Other Work and Plans

Book Discussion in joint seminar with the Eucharistic Prayer and Theology Seminar and the Liturgical Language Seminar: Gail Ramshaw, *Pray, Praise, and Give Thanks: A Collection of Litanies, Laments, and Thanksgivings at Font and Table*. Augsburg Fortress, 2017. Therese DeLisio, respondent from Ecology and Liturgy Seminar.

Environment and Art Seminar

Convener: Martin Rambusch, chairman, Rambusch Decorating Company

Members in Attendance: Eileen Crowley, Michael Driscoll, Martin Rambusch, Jan Robitscher, Julia Upton

Visitors in Attendance: Foy Christopherson, Suzanne Herold

Papers and Presentations

- “Repurposed Church Architecture” by Julia Upton, RSM, St John’s University, New York
- “All you Holy Men and Women Pray for Us: Learning from Saints and Relics in the Liturgical Environment” by Suzanne Herold
- “The Theology of the Pecking Order: A Barnyard Perspective on Places of Worship” by Richard Vosko, presented *in absentia* by Martin Rambusch

In addition, Foy Christopherson discussed his own parish’s renewal and expansion.

The seminar visited Christ Cathedral in Vancouver as well.

Other Work and Plans

The seminar discussed a possible presentation by Martin Rambusch on a recent renewal project, an update from Julia Upton, and a presentation by Foy Christopherson.

Eucharistic Prayer and Theology

Convener: Charles S. Pottie-Pâté, SJ, former teacher in liturgy and sacramental theology. Presently: Ecclesial Assistant for Christian Life Community in western provinces of Canada; pastoral work in Ignatian spirituality; and resident priest at St. Mary's Cathedral in Calgary, AB. Occasional lecturer at Atlantic School of Theology, Halifax, NS.

Members in Attendance: Robert Daly, SJ, Geoffrey Moore, Brett Peterson, Charles Pottie-Pâté

Visitors in Attendance Pekka Rahumaki

Papers and Presentations

This year's presentations and discussions were once again stimulating in the variety of presentations as well as the discussions that followed.

- John Rempel's *Order of Service for the Lord's Supper* began our sessions. Having one session with the *Liturgy and Environment* seminar and *Liturgical Language* seminar discussing Gail Ramshaw's new book *Pray, Praise and Give Thanks* A Collection of Litanies, Laments and Thanksgivings at Font and Table provided us with a rich discussion.
- Catherine Vincie asked us to give feedback to her *Cosmic Eucharistic Prayer* which proved to be a stimulating discussion.
- Brent Peterson's presentation on *Luther's Rejection Then and Possible Support Now of Sacrifice in the Eucharist* gave us a springboard for a lively exchange. He also offered us a draft of a *Eucharistic Prayer for Advent*.
- Our final presentation was Bob Daly's continuing work on *Ecological Eucharology*: "*Cosmic Liturgy*." We were able to pray through with sung acclamations his new draft of a "*Cosmic Eucharistic Prayer*".

Over all the Seminar sessions were very well spent.

Other Work and Plans

We hope to have a joint session with the new seminar formed this year on the ongoing dialogue of Roman Catholic and Lutheran traditions.

Exploring Contemporary and Alternative Worship

Convener: The Rev. Taylor W. Burton-Edwards, Director of Worship Resources (Liturgical Officer) with Discipleship Ministries of The United Methodist Church, Nashville, Tennessee (2005-2018); Chair, The Consultation on Common Texts; Treasurer, The Liturgical Conference; Secretary, The North American Academy of Liturgy

Members in Attendance: Cortlandt Bender, Brad Berglund, Taylor Burton-Edwards, Nelson Cowan, Swee Hong Lim, L. Edwards Phillips, Ron Rienstra, Lester Ruth, Alydia Smith

Visitors in Attendance: Billy Kangas, Matt Sigler, Noel Snyder

Description of Work

We heard presentations representing the variety of ongoing research and work our colleagues are doing within the varieties of contexts represented by “contemporary” and “alternative” expressions of Christian worship.

Papers and Presentations

- Taylor Burton-Edwards: “What’s in a Name? Pronouns and Titles for God in the 2017 CCLI Top 100.” Burton-Edwards presented the findings and conclusions of his research on the use of pronouns and titles for God across the spring 2017 release of the CCLI Top 100, the list of the 100 songs most reported as being used in worship by the roughly 150,000 congregations who subscribe to the CCLI license in the United States and Canada. Among significant findings were the entire absence of any feminine pronouns or titles for God in this collection, the dominance of ‘King’ as a non-divine title for God, the apparent rise of what Burton-Edwards calls “hybrid address song” since 2005 as a potential replacement for dedicated worship songs in worship sets, and the overall immaturity of the contemporary worship music market as reflected by the monopoly Capital Records related publishers hold in the Top 100 (78/100 songs). This presentation was recommended by the seminar for submission to *Proceedings* in essay form.
- Nelson Cowan: “Liturgical Biographies at Hillsong NYC: Data and/or Theology?” Cowan presented the core questions and methodologies he is implementing in the research of his dissertation which will seek to work with regular attenders of the Sunday evening service at Hillsong Church, New York City, to construct with them what he refers to as a “near-secondary liturgical

theology” drawing on their primary experiences in worship in that context. Seminar members were invited to offer constructive critique of the methods and suggest additional interview questions for Cowan’s research.

- Swee Hong Lim and Lester Ruth: (two presentations)
 - “The WFX Technology Conference with Implications for Contemporary/ Modern Worship.” Ruth and Lim shared their experiences at the 2017 WFX Technology Conference, the largest worship technology conference in North America, with insights for the ways both current and emerging technologies are being used and marketed to churches to strengthen the production value of their worship services.
 - “Two Streams and the Delta: Toward a Comprehensive History of Contemporary Worship” Lim and Ruth presented an outline view of an upcoming book which explores the history of contemporary worship movements from the interactions of its two primary antecedents in Pentecostal and mainline traditions.

Other Work and Plans

The seminar voted on two actions:

1. Election of Nelson Cowan as Convener, effective 2018
2. Recommendation of Taylor Burton-Edwards’s presentation for *Proceedings*.

2019 Initial Plans

Cortlandt Bender: “What’s New Is Old: Reflections from a Contemporary Service in a Traditional Church”

Nelson Cowan: “Update on Field Work and Dissertation”

Glenn Packiam: “Malaysian Pentecostal Sacramentality”

Ron Rienstra: “Beer and Hymns: Case Studies of an Emerging Practice”

Feminist Studies in Liturgy

Convener: Marcia McFee, Ph.D., is the Creator and Visionary of the Worship Design Studio, a training and resource website serving Protestant churches across the country. She is also the Visiting Professor of Worship and Ford Fellow at the San Francisco Theological Seminary.

Members in Attendance: Kathy Black, Dawn Chesser, Ruth Duck, Hyeran Kim Cragg, Diane Stephens Hogue, Marcia McFee, Myoung Sil Park, Beth Richardson, Susan Roll, Cynthia Wilson

Visitors in Attendance:
Colleen Hartung, Lisa Valle

Description of Work

The Feminist Studies in Liturgy seminar explored liturgies of lament and ritual of protest in secular and religious rituals. Presentations included the March on Washington, General Conference (UMC) rituals and hymns of lament. We also had a presentation on Irish pilgrimage and liturgical accompaniment.

Other Work and Plans

We are continuing to explore the dynamics of rituals of protest (especially the connections between the street and the sanctuary) as well as the possibility of a conversation with Bishop Karen Oliveto (Denver is her home base), the first out lesbian United Methodist Bishop, in order to explore the impact of her liturgical installation.

Formation for Liturgical Prayer

Convener: Patricia J. Hughes, Director of the Office of Worship, Catholic Diocese of Dallas; adjunct professor at the University of Dallas

Members in Attendance: Anthony Aarons, Stanislaus Campbell, Terry Fournier, Jeremy Gallet, Bernadette Gasslein, Patricia J. Hughes, Paul Janowiak, Michael Prendergast, Joyce Ann Zimmerman.

Visitors in Attendance: Brook Thelander

Description of Work

This seminar is shaped by a commitment to cultivating a profound awareness and analysis of the forces that affect formation for liturgical prayer. To achieve this purpose, the seminar members reflect, study, and dialogue on the ecclesial, social, psychological, pastoral, and cultural conditions that bear upon the celebration of liturgy. Embedded in the mission of the seminar is the development of scholarly writing to support the vision of the seminar.

Papers and Presentations

- Four key moments of dialogue took place, the initial discussion centering on considering Morning and Evening Prayer as viable liturgical prayer for the People of God. Questions were raised concerning the current revision of the Liturgy of the Hours taking place in Catholic liturgy: is this a conservative effort to “purify” the LOH, rather than an effort to put this into the hands of the People of God?
- A multifaceted discussion based on the 2017 review of *Seminary Formation* (Katarina Schuth, OSF, Liturgical Press, 2016) surfaced questions: 1) does current seminary formation indicate a profound misunderstanding of the common priesthood of the faithful, and 2) how do persons understand the notion of “church”—what is the ecclesial vision of the communion of the baptized, and 3) how is baptism understood as the common ground, plus the ontological change that happens in both baptism and the sacrament of orders? Major concern focused on concrete liturgical formation, based on an (re)appropriation of some of the key components of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. Review of four submissions outlining (priest or deacon) academic formation programs added to the depth of the discussion.
- The third part of the seminar’s work was an in-depth presentation of a chapter contributed by Paul Janowiak, SJ, which will appear in a shared book on

Contextual Theology. Problem posed: how do you teach liturgy contextually, when students have a “grounded” horizon, intersecting with each culture in every different age and time? Scholarly review of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* n. 2, 7, 10, 27, 40 contributed to the dialogue; partial conclusion is that we need to be part of the profound culture proposed by the Second Vatican Council, allowing the woundedness, the joy, the hope to challenge the Mystery.

- Attention was given to implications of the *Joy of the Gospel* in conversation with *Laudato Si* (both, Pope Francis)—asking, what is the Holy Father telling us about the direction that formation for liturgy should go? Seminar work concluded with brief discussion about Millennials and what they need in regard to formation for liturgical prayer: rich symbols? engagement experiences? hospitality? devotional prayer?

Other Work and Plans

In light of the work of Katarina Schuth in *Seminary Formation* and the 2018 discussion, group agreed to write a prophetic article proposing a vision of seminary education that liturgical scholars would like to see. Joyce Ann Zimmerman will contribute the outline, to include questions and challenges that propose a vision for the liturgy itself, the identity of the presbyter and the identity of the assembly at worship. Best hope is for a quarterly work ethic to contribution scholarly writing for the article. Also, the Denver 2019 meeting is an opportunity to surface a scholarly reflection from a guest speaker regarding the order in which the sacraments of initiation are received.

Historical Research: 16th Century to the Present

Convener: Katharine E. Harmon, Ph.D., is Assistant Professor of Theology at Marian University in Indianapolis, Indiana, where she teaches courses in liturgy, Catholic history, and theology to undergraduates and college seminarians. Kent J. Bureson, Ph.D. was the 2018 Convener *pro tem*. The Reverend Dr. Kent J. Bureson is Louis A. Fincke and Anna B. Shine Professor of Systematic Theology and Dean of the Chapel at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri, teaching courses in systematic theology and worship.

Members in Attendance: Sarah Blair, Rychie Breidenstein, Kent Bureson, Martin Connell, Tim Leitzke, Katharine Mahon, Hwarang Moon, Jonathan Riches, Kyle Schiefelbein-Guerrero, Frank Senn

Visitors in Attendance: Tim Gabrielli, Billy Kangas, Matt Sigler, Shawn Strout

Description of Work

Questions of historical methodology in the study of liturgy surfaced at the 2017 annual meeting and led the seminar on Friday to read and discuss, as led by Martin Connell, the book *Liturgy's Imagined Past/s: Methodologies and Materials in the Writing of Liturgical History Today*.

Papers and Presentations

- Hwarang Moon presented an essay intended for publication, “Martin Bucer on Eucharistic Theology in *Grund und Ursach*: A Korean Presbyterian Perspective.”
- Katharine Mahon also led the seminar into a revised chapter of her dissertation moving toward publication entitled “‘Teach us How to Pray’: Re-ritualizing Lay Prayer by Means of the Lord’s Prayer.”
- Jonathan Riches on “Liturgical Evangelical Revival: Toward Liturgical Change that Considers Doctrine and Culture.”
- Shawn Strout with a chapter of his dissertation entitled “‘Of Thine Own Have We Given Thee’: A Theology of the Offertory as Practiced by the Churches of the Anglican Communion.”
- Martin Connell, “Elizabeth Bishop’s Baptism: An Investigation.”
- Kyle Schiefelbein-Guerrero, “Digital Theology at the End of the Life Cycle: Implications for the *Ars moriendi* Tradition.”

Other Work and Plans

At the 2019 meeting in Denver the Seminar will be jointly reading a recently published work in liturgical studies, although the work to be read was not determined by the end of the 2018 meeting. Eight members and visitors agreed to bring papers/presentations to next year's meeting, although the slate of papers will be finalized throughout 2018. The seminar also will finalize prior to the 2019 meeting a proposed change of name for and description of the seminar.

Issues in Medieval Liturgy

Convener: Joanne M. Pierce and Michael G. Witczak. co-conveners. Joanne M. Pierce, Ph.D., is a Professor in the Department of Religious Studies at the College of the Holy Cross (Worcester, MA). Rev. Michael G. Witczak, S.L.D., is Associate Professor of Liturgical Studies and Sacramental Theology in the School of Theology and Religious Studies, The Catholic University of America (Washington, DC).

Members in Attendance: Michael Driscoll, Walter Knowles, Joanne Pierce, Michael Witczak, Anne Yardley

Visitors in Attendance: Nathan Chase

Papers and Presentations

- Michael Witczak presented the second installment of his comparative study of the prayers of apology in the current ordinary form of the order of Mass and the extraordinary form. The liturgy of the word has only one moment where apologies occur, at the time of the reading of the Gospel. The goal of the whole project is to explore the theology of priesthood as it is expressed in the changing use of the apologies. The next installment will be of the prayers in the Preparation of the Offerings/Offertory.
- Joanne Pierce discussed two on-going projects: a review of the history of reconciliation (for the Anglican-Roman Catholic Consultation in the U.S.), and the importance of the private Mass in the Church's self-understanding and "public face" (for a symposium at the Catholic University of Leuven, Belgium, *The Reshaping of Catholicism*).
- Anne Yardley presented her work in progress on the Office of the Virgin as observed in the Benedictine nunnery of Barking Abbey in the fifteenth century. She focused on the monastic as compared with lay versions of this office which is so widely incorporated in medieval Books of Hours.

The seminar also began a discussion of race/ethnicity/the "other" in medieval liturgy, a topic that has increasingly an issue in the wider area of medieval studies.

Other Work and Plans

The topic of "otherness" in medieval liturgy should continue next year, with a focus on Crusader liturgies and the liturgy of the Carmelites, and possibly liturgies for *conversi*. We plan to invite a specialist in the area of Crusader liturgy to participate in the seminar in January 2019.

Due to the reduced attendance at the January 2018 meeting, the interim convener for the January 2019 meeting will be Joanne Pierce; Walter Knowles has volunteered to be the interim convener for the January 2020. A new convener to serve a full three-year term will be chosen during this time.

Liturgical Hermeneutics

Convener: Ron Anderson, Styberg Professor of Worship, Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary, Evanston, IL

Members in Attendance:

Ron Anderson, Michelle Baker-Wright, Dirk Ellis, Edward Foley, Larry Hoffman, Ken Hull, David Hogue, Ruth Langer, Hwarang Moon, Gil Ostdiek, Sonja Pilz, Katherine Rickert, Marit Rong, Don Saliers, Frank Senn, Allie Utley

Visitors in Attendance:

Bruce Hiebert, Michael Krause, Gregor Sneddon, Michelle Whitlock

Description of Work

David Hogue lead a discussion of Mark Johnson's *The Meaning of the Body*, providing a continuation of a conversation begun the previous year about the embodiment of meaning. Hogue noted the ways in which Johnson takes on various dualisms, especially mind/body, emotion/experience, and of the theological themes with which Johnson concludes his work. Johnson claims that all human meaning is grounded in physical experiences and that body schemas are foundational for conceptual metaphors. Hogue also noted the importance in Johnson to begin questions of meaning with the biological body, expanding to the environmental body, then the phenomenological body, the social body, and the cultural body in which we are also shaped by the cultural artifacts we encounter and use.

Papers and Presentations

The seminar also received and discussed papers from several seminar members:

- Bruce Hiebert presented "The Christian Community: Enacted between Memory and Hope," drawing especially on work of anthropologist Alan Fisk, who is working on how human beings inherently organize their structures of life. In his paper Hiebert problematized "community" as potentially totalizing, resulting in violence and the elimination of the other. He proposed a reading of baptism, eucharist, and scripture as the means to symbolically reframe community as one that remembers its origins and looks forward in hope through the symbols (or sacraments) of churchly existence.
- Michelle Whitlock, in "Liturgical Practice: One Performance, Infinite Rehearsals," provided an overview responding to some of the seminar's previous discussions around "performance" as an interpretive category for litur-

gical practice. In her paper, she noted some of the problems and possibilities associated with the concept of performance, pointing to some of the ways in which liturgy is less the performance of a past narrative and more the rehearsal of narrative yet to come.

- Michelle Baker-Wright’s paper “Music, Ritual, Immediacy, and Memory: Exploring the Intersections” was an excerpt from a dissertation chapter that brings together a discussion of Talal Asad’s discussion of technologies of self (from Foucault) and Nathan Mitchell’s discussion of “symbol as action rather than as object” and the ways that actions connected to sacraments inform our sense of presence and shape our sense of agency. In paper and developing chapter she sought to demonstrate how Asad’s and Mitchell’s formulations of ritual add deeper dimensions to how performance connects with somatic memory, and how individual somatic memory connects to larger, communal, somatic traditions.
- In “PrayerSpace Project” Sonja Pilz provided an overview and introduction to a larger project that explores the meaning of contemporary Jewish liturgical spaces, especially for those communities who gather in “foreign” or “hybrid” spaces such as rented church spaces, high school auditoriums, parks, etc., and the consequence of those spaces for liturgy. Her project focuses on two primary questions: How do communities navigate such spaces? And, what constitutes a Jewish sacred space?
- In “Betwixt and Between: Pilgrimage as Individual and Communal Worship” Marit Rong used the Norwegian pilgrimage tradition and its renewed practice to explore the implications of the individual focus of new pilgrimage practices, the implied shift from “religion” to “spirituality” among those who engage in such pilgrimages, and the relation between individual pilgrimage experiences and the Christian symbols and spiritual life offered along the way.
- Allie Utley’s paper “Affect theory and the study of liturgy” represents a developing dissertation project that will explore how affect theory provides a generative framework for the study of preaching and provides tools to think about the social, embodied, and non-representational elements of preaching with a new level of theoretical depth and nuance, especially when language and cognition have been privileged in homiletic research.

Other Work and Plans

Although detailed plans did not emerge from our planning session for 2019, several proposals were offered and supported by the seminar: 1) invite follow-up reports/papers from Baker-Wright, Whitlock, and Utley; 2) ask David Hogue and Don Saliers to work together to lead a conversation on trauma and liturgy, social trauma, and lamentation; 3) in light the attention we have given to music, explore similar conversations with other arts; and 4) explore the question of meaning-making in a digital age.

Liturgical Language Seminar

Convener: J. Barrington Bates,

Members in Attendance:

Barrie Bates, Nancy Bryan, Bob Farlee, David Gambrell, Judith Kubicki, Gail Ramshaw

Visitors in Attendance:

Jennifer Baker-Trinity, David Bjorlin, Stephen Shaver

Description of Work

The Liturgical Language Seminar attends to issues of the language of worship by examining liturgical texts, considering scholarly essays, and discussing ideas and issues related to liturgical language. We welcome guest presenters and occasional participants, as well as Academy visitors and regular members. We occasionally meet jointly with another seminar, and sometimes we sing. We also strive to maintain a seminar group of a manageable size to encourage full and active participation by all.

Papers and Presentations

- Gail Ramshaw, "Four Principles of Liturgical Language"

She shared with the seminar a paper that she had presented at an Episcopalian consultation considering the possible revision of the *Book of Common Prayer*. The seminar participants judged most insightful her principle #2, that the psalms function as the primary model for Christian liturgical prayer. Her principle #1, which identified either past or future orientation of the rhetoric of liturgical language, may be too dualistic for useful analysis.

- Rhodora Beaton, "Language, Song, and the Senses: Liturgical Living in Light of Chauvet"

Her paper examined Louis-Marie Chauvet's approach to embodiment and the sacraments in light of recent discoveries regarding mirror neurons. She suggested several points of intersection between Chauvet's approach and contemporary neuro-science and concluded with a discussion of the implications for liturgical participation and sacramental efficacy.

- Judith M. Kubicki, Fordham University, "What's in a Name? How Do We Name God? How Do We Name Ourselves?"

She focused her presentation on how we name God and ourselves. She cited ancient and medieval texts to show that the Christian tradition has included writings that speak of God, not so much as without gender, but as beyond gender. These included “Ode 19” from the *Odes of Solomon* (2nd c), chapter 59 of Julian of Norwich’s *Shewings* (14th-15th c), and the scholarship of Janet Marie Soskice who speaks of the “kindness” of God to mean that God is “of our kind.” Kubicki included a consideration of the power of art and image to shape the imagination with a brief analysis of four Christian paintings, two of the Last Supper, one of the Good Shepherd, and the Lost Drachma. She concluded with an analysis of and listening to Bernadette Farrell’s hymn, “God beyond All Names.”

- David Gambrell, “Liturgical Language in the 2018 Book of Worship—PC(USA)”

He presented two excerpts from the forthcoming *Book of Common Worship* (WJKP, 2018): an illustrated “liturgical lexicon” (in English, Korean, and Spanish) of common words and gestures in worship, and liturgy for Trinity Sunday. With respect to the former, we considered the “canon” of common responses in the liturgy and the relationship between speech and embodied action. As for the latter, we discussed strategies and possibilities for naming and addressing the triune God in prayer.

- Jennifer Baker-Trinity, “Prayers (Litany, Confession, Intercession) Connected to the Proposed ELCA Social Statement on Women and Justice”

She presented recently crafted prayer resources connected to an ELCA draft social statement on women and justice.

- Stephen Shaver, “Metaphors of Eucharistic Presence”

He presented the introduction and contents of his project *Metaphors of Eucharistic Presence*, which draws from cognitive linguistics to propose a pathway toward reconciliation of inherited models of the relationship between the eucharistic elements and Christ’s body and blood.

- David Bjorlin, Hymn Texts: “When we have wandered,” “In wilderness we wander,” “Come now, O God,” “The God of Sarah praise,” “The Church of Christ cannot be sold,” “Filled with awe,” “Ask the complicated questions,” “Let our vocation be love,” “As a mother loves her children,” “God, make us agents of joyful rebellion,” and “Called and gifted for Christ’s service”

In studying newly-written hymn texts, he focused on the challenge of writing truly doxological texts in an age of political resistance, particularly the challenge he faced of trying to write texts with prophetic challenge that avoided becoming mere propaganda.

- Joint Session with the Ecology & Liturgy Seminar and the Eucharistic Prayer & Theology Seminar, to discuss Gail Ramshaw's recent publication *Pray, Praise, and Give Thanks: A Collection of Litanies, Laments, and Thanksgivings at Font and Table*

The Liturgical Language seminar joined with two other seminars, Ecology and Liturgy and Eucharistic Prayer and Theology, to discuss especially the ecological references in six of the prayers included in Gail Ramshaw's 2017 publication *Pray, Praise, and Give Thanks*. She began the discussion by speaking of the goal of normalizing ecological prayer, for example by including in every set of Sunday intercessions a petition for the earth. One member from each seminar group then presented a prepared response to her work, after which there was open conversation.

Liturgical Music

Convener: Steven R. Janco, who serves as Director of Music and Liturgy at St. Eulalia Parish in Maywood, Illinois. A well-known composer of liturgical music, Steve served from 2006-2017 as Director of the Rensselaer Program of Church Music and Liturgy at Saint Joseph's College, Rensselaer, IN.

Members in Attendance: Carl Bear, David Bjorlin, Emily R. Brink, Jon Gathje, Fred Graham, Carl Kim R. Harris, Alan Hommerding, Kenneth Hull, Steven R. Janco, Jason McFarland, Troy Messenger, Mark Miller, Michael O'Connor, Mikie Roberts, Anthony Ruff, OSB, Cynthia A. Wilson

Visitors in Attendance:

Rawn Harbor, Lisa Allen-McLaurin, Alydia Smith

Papers and Presentations

The following presentations were offered on Friday, January 5, 2018

- Kim R. Harris offered a presentation entitled "Sr. Thea Bowman: Liturgical Justice through Black Sacred Song."
- Michael O'Connor presented a current project entitled "A Performance of Love: Music and Liturgical Imagination."
- Jason McFarland discussed his most recent work on an ongoing project exploring "Music in Liturgical Studies."
- New NAAL member Mikie Roberts presented "A Survey of Caribbean Hymnody."

Most of **Saturday, January 6**, was spent on a topic to which the group had agreed in advance: "Music in Times of Crisis."

- Steve Janco offered a brief introduction and reflections on "The Healing Potential of Music as Ritual Symbol."
- Troy Messenger played and discussed excerpts from interviews with a number of instrumental musicians on "Instrumental Music in Times of Crisis."

Other Work and Plans

The group used "Hymns in Times of Crisis," a collection of hymn texts compiled and made available by the Hymn Society in the United States and Canada, as a starting point for discussion; but the group engaged in a wide-ranging conversation that touched upon denominational and ethnic/cultural traditions, as well as the participants' own personal and professional experience.

Liturgical Theology

Convener: Rhoda Schuler, Term professor of theology, Concordia University, St. Paul, MN.

Members in Attendance: Fred Ball, Hans Christoffersen, Bruce Cinquegrani, Doris Donnelly, Tim Gabrielli, Joris Geldhof, Christopher Grundy, Nathan Jennings, Todd Johnson, William Johnston, John Krueger, Judith Kubicki, Jan Rippentrop, Philip Standstrom, Thomas Scirghi, Rhoda Schuler

Visitors in Attendance: Cory Dixon, Gregor Sneddon

Description of Work

We discussed two books, Romano Guardini's *The Spirit of the Liturgy* (New York: Crossroad, 1998) and Jennifer McBride's *Radical Discipleship: A Liturgical Politics of the Gospel* (Fortress Press, 2017). The former was chosen to mark the centenary of its original publication in 1918. In the discussion of *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, introduced by William Johnston, seminar members recognized both the time-bound features of the book, which illuminated the context of his writing, and appreciated aspects of enduring significance in the work.

McBride's central question in *Radical Discipleship* is how privileged Christians can grow in discipleship. The author attempts to answer this question by appealing to the legacies of Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Dorothy Day, and Martin Luther King, Jr. The focus of the book is on McBride's overlapping experiences at a women's prison and the Open Door Community in Atlanta, Georgia. The Liturgical Year, from Advent to Pentecost, serves as the structure of the book. McBride's intention is to write a constructive theology out of the liturgical space that has been created at the Open Door Community, space intended to reduce distance across socio-economic and racial lines, between the housed and the homeless, and between inmate and free. The seminar engaged in lively conversation led by Judith Kubicki, particularly the strength of the book as constructive theology. In the end, most participants agreed that while the book was of value for other reasons, it did not actually provide a liturgical theology for the seminar to discuss and digest.

Papers and Presentations

- Jan Rippentrop, "Eschatological Liturgical Theology: Addressing the Whole Drama of the Christian Life and the Connection to Social Transformation": After summarizing the eschatological theology of various scholars, she argued that Christians have lost a vision of the Christian life as "an eschatolog-

ical drama” that is “linked to social transformation.” Rippentrop offered five “footholds” for reclaiming the relationship between eschatology and liturgy.

- John Kruger, “Singing the Sacrament: Martin Luther’s Communion Hymns”: Using two of Luther’s communion hymns, Kruger proposed that Luther’s hymnody had a “multitasking” role—his hymns both proclaim the Gospel and instruct those singing in the faith of the church.
- Melanie Ross, “The Evolution of the ‘Frontier Ordo’: Anton Baumstark Visits Willow Creek”: Part of a larger ethnographic research project, Ross uses Baumstark’s laws to interpret the evolution of evangelical worship at Willow Creek Church; her goal was to push “our disciplines to think more historically and objectively about evangelical worship traditions.” Melanie was virtually present for the discussion via Skype, as her flight from Hartford, CT was cancelled due to the winter storm.
- Joris Geldhof, “The 2002 Order of Mass: Incentives for Liturgical Theology”: After noting the complexity of the relationship between liturgical texts and the enactment of liturgies and offering “three patterns of thought” from liturgical scholarship to support his claim that the ordo provides theological insights in the Eucharist, Geldhof offers a textual study of the 2002 *Ordo Missae* in order to “challenge and stimulate contemporary liturgical theology.”

Other Work and Plans

The seminar selected Melanie Ross to serve as the next convener and then decided to continue in the tradition of reading two books: one classic and one contemporary work of liturgical theology. The selections for 2019 are:

- Alexander Schmemmann, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, c. 1966) ISBN 0913836184
- Bruce Morrill, *Divine Worship and Human Healing: Liturgical Theology at the Margins of Life and Death* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, c.2009) ISBN 081466217X

The following people have proposed presenting a paper:

- Timothy Brunk, on a topic to be announced
- Cory Dixon, an excerpt from his dissertation entitled “Saturation and Sacrament: Sacramental Revelation and the Philosophy of Jean-Luc Marion”
- Nathan Jennings, on a topic to be announced

Papers will be limited to 20 pages in length, and should be submitted to the convener for circulation by Thanksgiving.

Finally, Todd Johnson has expressed interest in leading a collaborative seminar project that will help the seminar think together about what liturgical theology is, does, and means over half a century since Schmemmann. Melanie Ross will set aside some time for this in the 2019 schedule.

Liturgy and Comparative Theology

Convener: James Farwell, Professor of Theology and Liturgy, Virginia Theological Seminary

Members in Attendance: James Farwell, Paul Galbreath, Ruth Langer

Description of Work

Despite anticipated absences and last-minute obstacles to travel for some of our members, this new seminar gathered around common texts to consider the forms a comparative theology might take if liturgical practice or the interpretation of liturgy were the focus of its comparison. Texts under discussion this year included Maria Reis Habito's "Bowing Before Buddha and Allah," and offerings by Langer, Carvahales, and Farwell.

Other Work and Plans

Over the course of the coming year, seminar members will read Emma O'Donnell's *Remembering the Future: The Experience of Time in Jewish and Christian Liturgy*. At our 2019 meeting we will devote part of our time to engagement with O'Donnell's text, and the rest to our members' works-in-progress.

Liturgy and Culture

Convener: Nathaniel Marx, Assistant Professor of Sacramental and Liturgical Theology at Saint Meinrad Seminary and School of Theology.

Members in Attendance: Bill Burke, Peter Dwyer, Mark Francis, Eunjoo Kim, Don LaSalle, Nathaniel Marx, Ruth Meyers, Hyuk Seonwoo

Description of Work

The seminar's work at this meeting addressed ministry, worship, and preaching in a variety of cultural and multicultural contexts.

Papers and Presentations

- Bill Burke reported on efforts in Canada to support native spirituality, leadership, and theological reflection among First Nations Catholics.
- Hyuk Seonwoo shared a paper on white privilege and the liturgical use of the color white during the Christmas season.
- Mark Francis discussed a recent article of his about obstacles and opportunities for more complete inculturation of the Roman Rite.
- Nathaniel Marx offered a presentation on the goals and initial implementation of the World Day of the Poor.
- The whole seminar engaged in a conversation with Eunjoo Kim about her newly published book, *Christian Preaching and Worship in Multicultural Contexts*.

Other Work and Plans

For the 2019 meeting in Denver, the seminar is especially interested in papers or presentations that explore contemporary changes in how families and communities in North America are or are not ritualizing death through religious practices including burial, cremation, and other forms of commemoration.

Problems in the History of Early Liturgy

Convener: Stefanos Alexopoulos, Assistant Professor of Liturgical Studies and Sacramental Theology, The Catholic University of America.

Members in Attendance: Harald Buchinger, Glenn Byer, Rick Fabian, Daniel Galadza, Lizette Larson-Miller, Christian McConnell, Annie McGowan, Mark Morzowich, Vitaly Permiakov, Nicholas Russo, Jim Sabak, Dominic Serra, Stephanie VanSlyke, Lisa Weaver, Fritz West

Visitors in Attendance: Nathan Chase, Charles Cosgrove, Liborius Limma, Martin Lüstraeten, Ramez Mikhail, Marie-Ange Rakotoniaina, Mark Schuler

Papers and Presentations

Seminar members and visitors presented the following papers, each followed my fruitful and engaging discussion.

- Stefanos Alexopoulos, “Beinecke 1155 and the Introductory Material of the Office of Holy Communion”

This paper presented in transcription the text of Beinecke 1155, a Byzantine liturgical scroll of the 14th century containing the private Office of Holy Communion, compared its contents with other scrolls of the same genre, identified textual variants in some of its prayers, and used it as a springboard for the discussion of the evolution of the introductory material of the Office of Holy Communion.

- Harald Buchinger, “Heortology in Transition: The Development of the Easter Cycle in the Late Antique East”

The paper investigated and partially reassessed substantial transitions (1) at the origin of the Easter feast as such (moment and significance of breaking the fast in quartodeciman and early dominical practice as well as its consequences for the termination of the paschal vigil in fourth-century sources), (2) at the origin of the Easter cycle (the persistence of the “unitive” paschal vigil and the spread of mimetic celebrations before and after Easter), and (3) in festal preaching (the exposition of “festal contents” and homilies as sources for the prehistory of the Byzantine liturgical year).

- Charles Cosgrove, “Women’s Unbound Hair in Ancient Christian Baptism”
This paper examines the rule in *Apostolic Tradition* that women unbind their

hair before being baptized. Similar rules about unbound hair in Greco-Roman ritual are considered, as well as W. C. van Unnik's proposal that the Christian requirement stems from customs of Jewish proselyte baptism (as documented in rabbinic writings). The paper also considers the subject of "meanings" attached to ritual gestures in antiquity and the extent and ways in which the meanings of ritual rules were familiar to officiants and participants.

- Daniel Galadza, "Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐλθὼν καὶ ἐρχόμενος: Palm Sunday in Jerusalem According to the *Typikon of the Anastasis*"

This paper examined the liturgical celebration of Christ's entry into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday as preserved in the twelfth-century Greek manuscript Hagios Stavros Gr. 43, known as the "Typikon of the Anastasis." After initial remarks about the history of the manuscript and its liturgical contents, a brief overview of the Palm Sunday liturgical services of the "Anastasis Typikon" is provided. The hymns from this manuscript, as well as the numerous rubrics regulating the performance of the hymns, are then analyzed in the context of other liturgical books from Jerusalem, for example the ancient Armenian Lectionary, the Georgian Lectionary, and the Tropologion (Iadgari), in order to understand the development of the Palm Sunday celebration and its processions in the "Anastasis Typikon" and their mimetic and anamnestic aspects. This study is part of a larger research project (Habilitation at the University of Vienna) on the hymnography of Holy Week and Easter in the "Typikon of the Anastasis" and a study of hymnography as liturgical theology entitled Ὑμνοῦμεν τὴν Ἀνάστασιν αὐτοῦ—*We Sing His Resurrection Hymnography for Holy Week and Easter as Liturgical Theology: Codex Hagios Stavros Gr. 43 (A.D. 1122) as Key to the Byzantine Rite*.

- Martin Lüstraeten, "Exorcism and the Rise of Christianity"

Starting with a quotation of the Praenotanda of the renewed rite of exorcism in the Roman-Catholic Church, this paper raised the question of whether Jesus did himself perform exorcisms, leading to an overview of current positions in Historical Jesus Research. After this, the attempt was made to describe the relationship between the exorcistic tradition inherent in the exorcism stories about Jesus on the one hand and the exorcisms of the Apostles as described in the New Testament on the other hand. In consideration of references to Christian exorcisms in the early apologetic tradition the paper closed with the question of to what extent liturgy can be found in the gospels.

- Liborius Lumma, "Some Remarks on the Latin Compline"

The Rule of the Master (RM)—presumably from Italy around 500 CE—offers the earliest outline of the Latin Compline as a ritual celebrated by a (monastic) community. Compline in RM contains three Psalms. Although RM does not say what Psalms are to be used, respected scholars presume the same psalms that the Rule of St. Benedict (RB)—some decade later—uses for Compline every

day: 4, 90 (91), and 133 (134). There are good reasons for that presumption, but one should be careful to use it as a basis for further argumentation.

- Anne McGowan, “Principles and Practices of Early Liturgy: An Orientation for Students”

This essay provided an overview of extra-biblical developments in the history and theology of Christian liturgy to ca. 500 CE, grounded in current scholarship but prepared for an audience of educated non-specialists. It surveyed the tremendous diversity of Christian ritual practices and their theological interpretation and explored the interconnection between liturgical celebration and theological reflection, focusing on initiation and Eucharist with select attention to other rites and the cultural and material context of early Christian worship practices.

- Ramez Mikhail, “Remarks on the Decline of the Diaconate. The Case of the Prothesis”

In this paper, Mikhail shared some of the pertinent examples of the decline in the deacon’s liturgy in the Coptic prothesis rite, primarily through a comparison of key liturgical sources of the 13th-15th centuries. He concluded with a preliminary attempt at explaining this decline in its historical context as a function of the difficult circumstances of the Coptic Orthodox Church under Mamluk rule.

- Nicholas Russo, “A New Look at Canon 5 of Nicaea in Light of Recent Work”

Canon 5 of the Council of Nicaea (325 CE) directs that two synods be held in each eparchy each year to ensure fairness and mutual recognition of ecclesiastical sanctions. The first of these is to take place *πρὸ τῆς τεσσαρακοστῆς*, “before the fortieth (*sic*).” Séverien Salaville (1910-1929) argued that Canon 5 refers to the fortieth day *after* Easter, overturning the longstanding assumption that it referred to Lent (ἡ τεσσαρακοστή). The paper proposed that the interpretation of Canon 5 should be reassessed in light of the recent and important work of Harald Buchinger and Alberto Camplani and suggests two plausible but equally problematic conclusions: (1) that Nicaea 5 refers to the fortieth day after Easter (Salaville), but because a 40-day pre-paschal fast was emerging at the same time in the East, the term ἡ τεσσαρακοστή was replaced in subsequent canons reiterating the instruction (Antioch 20, Apostolic 38) to avoid confusion, or (2) that Nicaea 5 refers to Lent (René-Georges Coquin, 1967) and that the later canons rescheduled the timing of the first synod, perhaps to make for easier travel. In either case, Nicaea 5 would be the first clear attestation of a solemnity on the fortieth day after Easter (1), long before the Ascension was commemorated on that day, or of Lent (2), long before ἡ τεσσαρακοστή became a common metonym for the pre-paschal fast.

- Vitaly Permiakov “A ‘Presbyteral’ Rite for the Installation of an Altar in Two 12th century Byzantine Euchologia”

Permiakov presented his findings concerning a unique Byzantine rite for the

installation of an altar table found in two 12th century Greek euchologia, *Sinai Greek O.973* and the so-called “Archimedes Euchologion.” This rite, which, remarkably, was supposed to be celebrated by two or three presbyters (not a bishop), has some similarities to the service for the installation of an altar that since the 11th century became part of the full Byzantine rite for the dedication of a church, but its main prayer has parallels with the hypothetical Jerusalem rite for the dedication of a church, preserved through Armenian and Georgian sources. The rubric indicating that this rite of installation could have been followed by a liturgy (in the “Archimedes Euchologion”) led Permiakov to conclude that this rite at some point and in some specific localities could have functioned as a complete rite for the dedication of a new altar.

- Marie-Ange Rakotoniaina, “The Baptism of Clovis or the Geopolitics of Liturgy”

The present paper explored the liturgical and political fashioning of the myth of Clovis’ baptism. First, baptism narratives in Gregory of Tours and Avitus demonstrated how parallels between Christ, Constantine and Clovis make the latter the archetype of a Christian King newly born at Christmas. The paper then examined how the writings of Hincmar of Reims, Flodoard, and the iconographic program of Reims Cathedral contributed to the transformation of Clovis’ baptism into a royal coronation.

- James Sabak, “Impeding the Body-Dynamic: Restrictions on the Manner of Celebrating Martyrs’ Vigils in Ancient Roman Practice”

In the Roman practice of holding vigils in celebration of the martyr-saints in the early centuries of Christianity, we find an interesting contrast between popular piety and structured liturgical event. This contrast manifests the gradual transformation of what appears to be a lively and dynamic remembrance of the martyr-saints, one filled with banqueting and dancing at the tombs and gravesides, into a more ascetic and spiritualized liturgical experience. This paper offered a survey of the popular Christian experience of commemorating martyr-saints in Rome and its environs, comparing and contrasting these experiences with non-Christian practices, which dealt with the dead and with the honoring of ancient heroes. Among the questions for further discussion, which the paper raised are:

Did the “solemn sacralization” of what appears to have been the popular, enthusiastic nature of keeping vigil with the saints move the saints further to the other side of a line that divided humanity from the divine? A move that transforms them from imitators to intermediaries?

Did the departure initiated by ecclesiastical leaders from ways in which Christianity differed from their contemporaries in the manner they approached death and honored those who died contribute a more strident Christianity whose concerns in the late antique and early medieval periods were turned to ideas of spiritual worthiness and judgment before God?

How does the loss of a popular *earthiness* in the festive nature of keeping memorial of the saints affect contemporary celebration of them?

- Mark Schuler, “A Chalcedonian Move? Sixth-Century Modifications to the Churches of Hippos Palaistinēs”

A concentration of churches has been discovered in the urban area of Hippos Palaistinēs. Based on the plans of the basilical churches and the various concentrations of finds, the claim in this paper was that the mixed community of Hippos Palaistinēs underwent a theological change in the sixth century CE, which is reflected in the architecture of the churches. The participation of the city’s bishops in synods in Jerusalem, which took clear Chalcedonian positions, presumably initiated the changes.

- Dominic Serra, “Baptisteries and Fonts in Late Antique Rome: Questions Raised by the Archeological Evidence”

This paper reviewed the extant fonts constructed for use in late antique Rome and its environs. The evidence raised some questions about the practice of baptism in Rome and its Suburbicarian Sees and about the theology of sacramental initiation and about some ecclesiological issues.

Other Work and Plans

Jim Sabak was elected the new convener of the seminar for a three-year term commencing at the end of the 2018 meeting.

Queering Liturgy

Convener: W. Scott Haldeman, Associate Professor of Worship, Chicago Theological Seminary

Members in Attendance:

Sharon Fennema, Scott Haldeman, Don LaSalle, and Jason McFarland

Visitors in Attendance:

Lyn Boire, Lis Valle-Ruiz

Description of Work

On Friday morning, we gathered and took some time to check in with one another about the year past and current work. We, then, prayed and sang a brief morning prayer for a queer epiphany. We talked about if and how what we had just enacted was queer before heading off to lunch.

Papers and Presentations

- On Friday after lunch, we discussed a book outline/proposal that Sharon Fennema is working on—*Queering Worship: A Primer*. The book will introduce the concept of “queering” worship, and, then, in subsequent chapters, takes up a variety of ways one might embody this in actual faith communities: by troubling norms, by highlighting multiplicity, by bringing queer presence into view, and by exploring desire. Sharon asked us to help her identify concrete examples for each of these chapters. We look forward to seeing a complete draft and having further discussion next year.
- On Friday after coffee break, we took up a draft paper by Bryan Cones entitled “With all due respect, I **ain’t** his *husband*: Gender, sexuality, and theology in the Episcopal Church’s rites of partnership.” Unfortunately, Bryan was not able to travel to Vancouver from Melbourne where he is pursuing his studies; we were honored that he sent his draft work for us to discuss. Within a larger reflection on resonances of the word “husband” in the rapidly changing cultural and ecclesial contexts in which marriage equality is expanding and his own relationship is situated, Bryan reads closely two distinct liturgies: “The Celebration and Blessing of a Marriage in the 1979 *Book of Common Prayer* and “The Witnessing and Blessing of a Life-Long Covenant” from *I Will Bless You and You Will be a Blessing* (ECUSA, 2015). In particular, the words chosen to designate the couple and the list of biblical texts that are suggested for use point, in his view, to two contrasting theologies of marriage—neither of which is fully satisfying to Bryan. We look forward to the final paper and to subsequent work from this emerging scholar.

- On Saturday morning, we discussed a draft paper by Scott Haldeman—"The Queer Body at the Wedding." Scott is exploring the question: what makes a queer wedding queer? He proposes three primary models—a traditional ceremony followed closely except with a same-sex couple as primary ministers, inclusive ceremonies that have been modified to not reference the gender of the couple (which, following Bryan's work may entail a distinctive theology of marriage), and reinvented rites that reconstruct the wedding in light of realities of queer lives. Which is (most) queer? Perhaps, all three!

Other Work and Plans

In Denver, we plan to meet in a hybrid arrangement in hopes of finding a happy medium in which we have focused seminar conversations but also allow those who are committed to other seminars to contribute to our conversations. We will meet all day Friday, including the lunch hour, and then not meet on Saturday. On Friday, we will focus on further developments on Sharon Fennema's draft manuscript, *Queering Worship: A Primer*. We also are soliciting papers on the topic: ***how does a queer body matter in/to/for worship?*** Please email the convener if you would like to write a paper to share with us in Denver. Other potential papers (or, topics for discussion) include a poetics of queerness in liturgical settings, queering Eucharist, and modes of queer preaching/ritualizing. We may also pursue joint sessions with other seminars; for example, the feminist group.

The Seminar on the Way

Convener: Gordon W. Lathrop, Professor of Liturgy Emeritus, Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia,

Members in Attendance: John Baldovin, Kim Belcher, Joseph Donnell, Benjamin Durham, Virgil Funk, Jon Gathje, Dirk Lange, Jennifer Lord, Bruce Morrill, Melinda Quivik, Carl Rabbe, Anthony Ruff, Martin Seltz, David Turnbloom, Paul Westermeyer

Visitors in Attendance: Cory Dixon, Ken Hull, Pekka Rehumaki, Brook Thelander

Invited Guests: Jim Puglisi, Kathryn Johnson, Kevin Strickland, John Weit

Description of Work

The Seminar on the Way, which met for the first time in Vancouver, is devoted to discussing issues dividing the Lutheran and the Roman Catholic churches, as outlined in the shared document *Declaration on the Way*, seeking to discover whether liturgical practice and liturgical studies may be of assistance in resolving or mitigating these issues. After an initial orienting discussion, six papers were presented and discussed. Observations from the Reformed perspective and from the perspective of the international Lutheran-Roman Catholic dialogue and plans for 2019 concluded our first meeting.

The Seminar began with a consideration of the charge given to mutual study by the joint statement of the Lutheran World Federation and the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity at the conclusion of the year of common commemoration of the Reformation. We then invited the comments of two guests, Kathryn Johnson, an ecumenical officer of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and one of the drafters of *Declaration on the Way*, and Jim Puglisi, director of Centro Pro Unione in Rome and former Minister General of the Friars of the Atonement. The fifteen “Remaining Differences” articulated by the *Declaration* were then considered, and the group brainstormed possible liturgical-theological matters that we might explore as offering further “Reconciling Considerations.”

Papers and Presentations

The discussion of papers followed and took the majority of our time. The six papers were these:

- Paul Westermeyer, “Eucharistic Fellowship: An Autobiographical Approach”; Virgil Funk, “Shared Communion . . . Revisited”
- Bruce Morrill, “Symbol and Sacrifice: Problems in Roman Catholic Theology and Practice, Official and Popular”
- Gordon Lathrop, “*Sacrifice* as a Word that Cracks: One Liturgical Consideration Moving Forward”
- Benjamin Durham, “Just Liturgy: Connecting Theological Ethics and Liturgical Practice”
- John Baldovin, “The Twentieth Century Reform of the Liturgy: Outcomes and Prospects”

Four of the papers were paired, with Westermeyer and Funk and then Morrill and Lathrop presenting together, then having a chance to respond to each other before the general discussion ensued. The Seminar later determined that it would like to proceed in this way in the future, with paired papers enabling direct dialogue.

Westermeyer and Funk helped us to begin with the *cri de coeur* of many people in our time as we seek for shared eucharist, turning then to the actual and canonical situation in our churches. Morrill and Lathrop moved into the theological and liturgical discussion of “eucharistic sacrifice,” one of the most vexing issues dividing Roman Catholics and Lutherans. Morrill invited us—as he has invited his students and his church—to consider the entire action of the eucharist, and not simply the priestly acts, as a “meal sacrifice,” celebrating covenant. Lathrop, following the work of David Power, urged that for the New Testament neither the cross of Christ nor the Christian life nor the eucharist can be called “sacrifice” literally. These rather are metaphors, and metaphors—as we know from liturgical practice generally—surprise us and reorient us in the world. Ecumenical help can be found in a recovery of metaphor. Durham’s paper then invited us to make use of virtue ethics to consider the ways in which liturgical practice is or is not itself just, concluding with using these considerations to ask what “intermediate steps” might enable our assemblies to grow gradually and responsibly in ecumenical exchange and hospitality. Finally, Baldovin used liturgical reform in all of our churches to consider how we have received gifts together and from each other. As a case in point, he outlined the Lutheran recovery of eucharistic praying and then directly engaged and responded to one particular set of Lutheran objections to that recovery as found in the work of Oliver Olson.

In the last session of the Seminar, Jennifer Lord, who had been a full participant in our work, responded to what she had heard from the point of view of Reformed theology and practice, and Dirk Lange reported to us about the work of the international Lutheran-Roman Catholic dialogue, giving us also some background on the liturgy of common prayer held in Lund in October of 2016. The plan had been to ask a similar response from an Anglican perspective, but Neil Alexander, a member of the Seminar, was unable to attend due to weather delays.

Other Work and Plans

The Seminar asked Tom Schattauer and John Baldovin to serve as co-conveners for the coming three years. We also proposed paired papers on ordination (Joseph Donnelly and Jim Puglisi) and on eucharistic sacrifice again (Max Johnson and David Turnbloom), and stand-alone papers on baptism (Tom Schattauer) and on ELCA sacramental practice (Melinda Quivik, Martin Seltz, and John Baldovin).

Word in Worship

No report received



Part 3

Select Seminar Papers

Just Liturgy: Connecting Theological Ethics and Liturgical Practice

Benjamin Durheim

Introduction

There has been a good deal of scholarly work done on sacramental practice—particularly eucharistic fellowship—through the lenses of history, sacramental/liturgical theology, and ecclesiology (among others), but relatively little done from a standpoint of theological ethics.¹ Justice, thus far, does not appear to be a central category in speaking about how Christians celebrate together, or not.² The importance of liturgy actually inspiring ethics and work for justice (or, termed differently, conforming us to Christ) has been well established, but such emphasis tends to stop short of examining the justice of liturgical practice itself.³ This is especially apparent in Lutheran-Roman Catholic relationships, as joint Lutheran-Roman Catholic documents like *Declaration on the Way* tend to shy away from questions of justice or ethics when speaking of eucharistic fellowship. However, *Declaration on the Way* does recognize that there is work to be done in outlining “intermediate sacramental steps” in pursuit of eucharistic fellowship.⁴ This paper argues that including a lens of theological ethics, specifically virtue ethics, empowers sacramental theology to articulate more explicitly what is at stake in sacramental practice, especially in the question of eucharistic fellowship. For liturgical/sacramental scholarship to speak more poignantly to unresolved issues in Lutheran/Roman Catholic dialogue, especially eucharistic fellowship, it must ask whether the practices it studies are not simply theologically sound, but also just. This enlivens a previously underused vantage point from which to approach the issue, and ultimately leads to implications for eucharistic fellowship (or intermediate steps toward it) that rightly return the category of justice to the exercise of sacramental theology and practice.

Cautions, and How to Proceed

Inviting theological ethics to the altar can strike an odd tone in the chorus of work done connecting liturgy and justice. A great number of recent and contemporary theologians have illustrated forcefully and with penetrating insight not only that liturgical practice must lead into work for justice, but also the ways in which such work is inspired by and grows organically from the celebration of liturgy.⁵ Louis-Marie Chauvet’s *Symbol and Sacrament* is by now nearly a classic treatment of the interplay of ethics, sacraments, and scripture (at least in North America), and the work of theologians such as Don Saliers, Gordon Lathrop, Bruce Morrill,

Alexander Schmemmann, Robert Hovda, and others tirelessly keep an eye on the necessary connection of the Christian ethical life to the church's liturgical life.⁶ Even thinkers whose primary areas of research are not liturgical or sacramental theology have taken renewed interest in whether and how Christian ritual informs ethics: the work of M. Shawn Copeland comes to mind, connecting Eucharist to racial (in)justice,⁷ as does the writing of William Cavanaugh,⁸ pointing out the reciprocal influence of political injustice and Eucharist. What these bodies of work largely do not provide however, is a framework for considering the ethics of liturgical practice itself.

To be clear, the issue is not that liturgical practice is *never* evaluated in light of ethics and justice. Rather, such attention often tends to treat theological ethics as a facet of or means to move forward a connected, but distinct, theological project, such as pastoral liturgical theology,⁹ or an analysis of the viability of inculturation,¹⁰ or maintaining the connection between liturgical practice and dogmatic imagery.¹¹ Theological ethics appears to greater and lesser extents in these areas, but the ethics of how liturgy is itself practiced is not often the central focus.

In some cases of course, this reticence can be intentional. Without falling too far into conjecture, there are at least three reasons that one might see it as wise or prudent to shy away from analyzing liturgical practice from the standpoint of theological ethics, or three reasons one might call this current discussion ill-advised. The first possible objection is that great care should be taken in inviting theological ethics to the altars of multiple Christian communions, where such emphasis might not only strike an odd tone, but also runs the risk of being counter-productive ecumenically. Luther and his contemporaries certainly had few qualms about calling one liturgical approach virtuous and another vicious, but a great deal of time, love, and work has gone into moving the ecumenical conversation away from immediate value-judgments and toward respectful, appreciative dialogue.¹² Including a lens of theological ethics in liturgical/sacramental theology, one could argue, necessarily includes the impulse to judge various liturgical approaches as more or less right, more or less virtuous, more or less just. This impulse then opens the door to sliding back into at least one place ecumenism has attempted to grow out of: the lived experience of divided and divisive liturgical celebration, where diversity *as* diversity is undesirable because it stands to reason that some liturgical practices are better—ethically—than others.

In a word, this objection is correct, but misplaced. Yes, allowing theological ethics a place on the altar may—must!—lead to recognition of vice and virtue, especially of justice and injustice, in the very liturgical practices, rubrics, and theologies where they are embedded. However, the effects of liturgical justice and injustice play out in the lives of Christians regardless of whether one names that justice or injustice theologically.¹³ Harm wrought in liturgical encounter is not nullified simply because it is not named as such, and healing or growth animated by litur-

gical practice does not evaporate for want of accolade. Certainly these are not reducible only to functions of theological ethics, but there is nevertheless a strong theological-ethical component to the experience of liturgy. For example, if liturgy has no explicit way of addressing racial violence and prejudice in a culture rife with them, liturgy does not just lose relevance; it inflicts moral damage on victims and those who would stand in solidarity with them, erasing that ethical demand. If liturgy has no way to speak to the experience of those suffering domestic abuse, it does not just become a burden to the abused; its silence supports the abuser, and this is unjust. If liturgy divides Christians rather than binding them together in love,¹⁴ it is not just a religious misfire; this carries ethical weight.

The same is true for the reverse: when liturgy makes space for lamentation¹⁵ and healing in the wake of a tragedy, this is not just religious; it is virtuous. When someone encounters the racial or cultural other in liturgy and is moved outside of fear or suspicion, this is not just a liturgical triumph; it is a moral one. When liturgy embodies the full humanity of persons of all genders, it is not just inclusive, feminist, or diverse; it is in this respect, just. The point here is that yes, there are some liturgical practices (and rubrics, and theologies) that are more or less virtuous than others, and it is *because* of this, rather than in spite of it, that liturgical/sacramental theology needs to appropriate whatever tools of theological ethics it can use.

A second objection could be raised on the basis of presumption or authority. Would it not be presumptuous, one might ask, to evaluate the ethical worth of a liturgical practice unless one is explicitly given authority to do so, and even then only within one's own liturgical community or communion? Wouldn't the risk of offense be too great, if theologians (as well as Christian liturgical assemblies) began calling out unjust or harmful liturgical practices, and praising other, more virtuous ones?¹⁶ Like the first objection, this concern is not completely mistaken, but it names a worthwhile risk rather than a reckless one. A similar concern could be raised about liturgical and sacramental theology more generally: wouldn't it risk offense to call out problematic liturgical/sacramental theologies, or to extol less problematic ones? Essentially, if theologians claim authority to study and evaluate the liturgical and sacramental theologies that inform Christian ritual practice, then there is no reason for them to shirk responsibility to study and evaluate the theological ethics that permeate that ritual practice. The danger of presumption—the possibility of offense—does not render liturgy immune to theological-ethical reflection and even evaluation.

The third objection that one could raise to the current discussion is that it risks blurring the border between the distinct disciplines of theological ethics on the one hand, and liturgical/sacramental theology on the other. Ethicists do ethics, one might claim, and liturgical/sacramental theology is best left to liturgical/sacramental theologians. While there is some wisdom in this caution as well (certainly

specialization in study does serve some set of purposes), there is an important difference between distinguishing theological disciplines and balkanizing theology altogether. The former encourages shared endeavor by recognizing particular approaches and methodologies, while the latter breeds suspicion and even conflict over academic turf and prerogative.¹⁷ Theology, and ecumenical theology particularly, benefits from open and vibrant dialogue. There is no reason this dialogue should only be between churches; it is also necessary among disciplines.

Beyond the basic importance of keeping academics talking with one another, there is little reason to tolerate a divide in theology where the same divide in Christian life itself would be called hypocritical. If a Christian—or especially an entire Christian community—would give her-/himself utterly to the practice of liturgy and thereby ignore the Christian call to ethics and justice, that disconnect would grow into hypocrisy. The parable of the Good Samaritan comes to mind (Luke 10:25-37).¹⁸ Likewise, liturgical/sacramental theology has no good excuse to shield itself from theological ethics,¹⁹ even and especially when diverse approaches to liturgical practice encounter one another (as in ecumenism). For similar reasons, I would even hesitate to call a theological-ethical approach to liturgical practice “interdisciplinary.” If the practice of liturgy might even remotely be called a “discipline,” then to be done well it has need not only of coherent liturgical/sacramental theology, but also of a coherent theological, even liturgical, ethics.

This third objection has another level, however. Perhaps bringing theological ethics to the altar does not confuse theological disciplines, but is the endeavor itself not redundant? If liturgy is theologically and pastorally sound, isn’t it therefore also moral, ethical, just? Would it be even conceivable to concoct a coherent theological and pastoral approach to liturgy, which is also unjust, unethical, vicious? In a word, yes, because the coherence of theological approaches takes place in human minds and bodies twisted by sin. It is not that an unethical liturgical/sacramental theology or practice might *be* coherent; rather unethical theology or practice might *appear* coherent to those practicing it, and therefore would also appear morally innocuous or even praiseworthy. The interplay of race and liturgy in the United States provides a powerful set of examples in this regard, as Shawn Cope-land points out,²⁰ and as Katie Walker Grimes has more recently (and forcefully) developed especially in relation to baptism and eucharist.²¹ If theologies are to check each other, I would suggest it would be closer to the truth to maintain the reverse: if liturgy is ethical, just, virtuous, then it is likely also theologically and pastorally sound. On the other hand, perhaps this image of competing theological approaches is not necessary; that is the center of the current point. If it strikes one as odd to assume theological or pastoral coherence on the basis of justice or virtue, then there is little reason to assume justice or virtue on the basis of theological or pastoral coherence. To be done well, liturgical/sacramental theology has a real need for theological ethics.

Gifts Theological Ethics Leaves on the Altar

If theological ethics has gifts to bring to the altar, then like the real, embodied gifts of those in the liturgical assembly, the gifts of theological ethics must be concrete and relevant, not abstract “things to keep in mind” that may evaporate if they begin to trouble liturgical/sacramental theology (and the point of this discussion is that in certain cases, they likely will do exactly that). This section of the discussion outlines three of these gifts theological ethics—most especially in the guise of virtue ethics²²—can offer liturgical/sacramental theology: first, virtue ethics provides categories for recognizing, naming, and working to heal moral damage that ritual has the potential to inflict; second, Christian virtue ethics in the light of liturgical practice can help recognize damage not just to individuals but to relationships; third and finally, virtue ethics provides a toolset for throwing into relief how particular Christian rituals help build up or tear down habits of working for justice outside liturgy itself.

The first gift, of recognizing when and how moral damage is inflicted by ritual (and how it might be undone), calls for a brief discussion of what moral damage is, and how it interacts with virtue. Lisa Tessman provides the most helpful definition of moral damage for this discussion, explaining that “[m]oral damage occurs when there is a certain sort of self that one ought to be, but the unconducive conditions of oppression bar one from cultivating this self.”²³ Moral damage in this view is not the result of vicious behavior or individual moral failing, but of a set of structures and circumstances that prevent the growth of virtue in a self. Drawing from Claudia Card, Tessman argues that moral damage occurs in a context of bad “systemic, constitutive, moral luck,”²⁴ meaning both that the moral milieu in which a self lives is largely outside the control of that self, and that sometimes the moral milieu is determinative of and harmful to the self’s moral identity. Put another way, moral damage occurs when Chauvet’s triple body of culture, tradition, and nature are twisted into systems of sin.²⁵ If the womb that gives a self its moral life is itself unjust, then the moral luck one receives is systemic, constitutive, and bad, and the self is susceptible to moral damage.

The central aims in adopting this category of moral damage are both to make the leap between Tessman’s attention to oppression and our current attention to Christian ritual, and to highlight the formative nature of liturgy with regard to recognizing and clinging to justice and virtue. The first aim is essential because one might rightly object at this point that liturgy is not oppression. At worst it is a set of practices that can buttress or even embody injustice, but to call liturgy oppression does a disservice to those who suffer more violent and potent forms of oppression. This point deserves pause, but oppression is not monolithic, and its pertinent attributes—being systemic and constitutive—are very much shared by liturgy and sacraments. In Tessman’s quote above, “oppression” could be replaced by “liturgy,” and the implications about moral damage would remain strikingly similar as far as liturgical/sacramental theology is concerned. This is not to say

that liturgy is everywhere and always oppressive, but rather that liturgy done without an eye to justice and virtue runs the risk of damaging moralities in an analogous way to systems of oppression. This leads us to the second aim of attending to the category of moral damage.

That liturgy forms the ways in which persons recognize and name virtue and justice is both explicit and implicit in liturgical practice. It is explicit most especially in the readings, preaching, and prayers of the faithful, where the liturgical assembly hears in the cadence of the lectionary formative accounts of what discipleship means, unpacked (ideally) by preaching that keeps the community in conversation with those accounts, and where the assembly responds in praise and petition for God's goodness. These sets of words, elevated to formal ritual roles, take a privileged place for Christians in defining justice and virtue. As such, if they miss the mark²⁶—incidentally or especially systemically—they are privileged instruments by which moral damage is inflicted. In this kind of moral damage, it is not that a self can see what is just and virtuous but cannot attain them; it is that the self is turned away from what is just and virtuous in the first place, by the very instruments meant to help unveil justice and virtue. Implicitly, the liturgy carries in its very structures the echoes of just and unjust systems and ideals that created it. Are all races welcomed in the celebration? Are all genders included in the practice? Are young and old both valued in love? Who is at the altar? Who is making music, and how are they compensated? What materials are being used, and from where did they come? Who is in the pews? The answers to these questions very likely have a multitude of answers both systemic and particular, but their answers are formative of the assembly's view of justice and virtue. The veil between the way things are and the way things should be can thin around the altar, both for better (in cases where the liturgical celebration very well becomes an icon of the Kingdom of God) and for worse (in cases where the liturgical structure eschews God's Kingdom in favor of harmful ideologies). In the case of the worse, what is at stake is not just good liturgy; it is also the danger of moral damage to those in the liturgical assembly.

While Tessman's treatment of moral damage tends to focus heavily on the effects on the moral self, it is not only the self that is formed and re-formed in liturgical practice. Relationships also, for better or worse, can be sculpted by liturgical encounter, and this is the second gift virtue ethics brings to the altar. One significant difficulty in dealing with structural sin (or as Tessman would call it, oppression), is that it often takes some significant work to even unmask as what it is. Eduardo Bonilla-Silva's seminal work *Racism Without Racists* is a prime example of the difficulty that comes with naming structures of sin, and the embedded resistance that often meets that endeavor.²⁷ Liturgy, on the other hand, is (among other things) quite transparently a set of structures and structured practices, so the project of naming structures as what they are is already partly accomplished. This rare point of clarity in dealing with potentially harmful (or healing) structures affords a head start to the work of virtue ethics in liturgical/sacramental theology.

This start in clarity means precious little however, if it is not carried forward. As we discussed above, the clarity of liturgical structures can lead to caution in diagnosing them as more or less virtuous, because implied in that diagnosis is some communal, liturgical response to it. However, virtue does not need to be absolutely quantifiable in order to be recognizable. The same is true for harm or injustice; if a liturgical practice mars an otherwise healthy relationship (for example, if a liturgical practice ostracizes, or if it celebrates vice, or if it is officiated by one who has deeply hurt the community and has not been reconciled²⁸), the damage may be real but indeterminate. It would be like pain, recognizable and quantifiable only to those involved, rather than like life and death, visible to everyone. The biblical admonition to “hold fast to what is good” (1 Thess. 5:21) is sound advice where liturgy and virtue are concerned. The work of virtue ethics in evaluating liturgy’s effects on relationships can be largely thought of as bolstering practices that inspire loving relationships to flower, and reforming practices that leave bruised or broken relationships in their wake. Where does liturgical practice help? Do more of that. Where does liturgical practice harm? Do less of that.²⁹

The third gift virtue ethics brings to the altar is a set of tools that can help flesh out how liturgy can better form Christians for virtue outside the explicitly liturgical setting, and how liturgy can also misfire in that cause. Virtuous liturgy may not be a surefire cause of virtuous Christianity, but virtue ethics can at least offer some ways to recognize what is likely to help and what isn’t. Ecumenically, this is especially important, because it helps alleviate the problems that can crop up if one falls into only calling liturgies “bad” or “good.”³⁰ A great example of this is the difficulty (or not) associated with common liturgical celebration in connection with ecumenical work for justice.³¹ In this situation questions of eucharistic fellowship tend to take center stage, with the end result usually being either to leave out the eucharist altogether, or to celebrate multiple liturgies in multiple traditions. One might tweak the old adage that “doctrine divides, while service unites,” to say that “liturgy often divides, while service more often unites.” Often enough liturgical prayer and practice can overcome ecumenical division, but the goodness of this triumph is only powerful because of the ill of division that preceded it. It is virtuous only because it works to minimize a pre-existing vice. As David Farina Turnbloom and I have argued elsewhere, liturgy can perform and enforce ecumenical division just as it can challenge it,³² and this problem is not morally neutral. One main reason the issue of ecumenical liturgical practice—especially eucharistic fellowship—is not morally neutral is that the selves and relationships formed in that liturgical practice stand to be injured or healed in greater or lesser degrees depending on how the practice unfolds. It is not simply a matter of taste or preference, like chocolate versus vanilla ice cream. Relatively few persons may truly be said to be injured by the ice cream preferences of their friends or neighboring communities.³³ By contrast, a great many persons hold in their formative religious experiences those times when they have been excluded or shut out, or conversely when their religious convictions have been ignored or disregarded. This is one

kind of liturgical injury, one kind of liturgical injustice, and as the recent Lutheran-Roman Catholic documents have pointed out, it is not a problem simply solved by either maintaining current practices without reform, or by dissolving all potential questions into forced eucharistic fellowship; intermediate steps are called for.³⁴

This very question of intermediate steps is where virtue ethics shines. Instead of focusing on the absolute rightness or wrongness of discrete actions, virtue ethics emphasizes training and habituation into virtuous living. Absent dramatic conversion experiences, the stuff of this training is made up of intermediate steps, and the ecumenical movement thus far is already built upon many of them.³⁵ Additionally, emphasizing intermediate steps ordered toward virtue can better acknowledge and engage the real, messy, lived experience of liturgical assemblies, where virtue and vice very often coexist in rubric and practice. Churches do not have to fix everything to perfection by the end of today, or by tomorrow, or by next week, especially when the current situation is not altogether due to the actions of contemporary churches (instead, again, constitutive, systemic moral luck plays a part). Here also Tessman's work is illuminative:

"Taking responsibility and fully 'standing behind' one's own (or others') imperfect characters and choices—and counting this as virtue...may permit members of oppositional communities greater room for moral disagreement with each other, without the condemnation that follows from denying a place to luck."³⁶

If liturgical/sacramental theology can include a lens of theological ethics (in this case, virtue ethics) without outright condemnation of existing practices, then the groundwork is laid for steps to be taken toward greater liturgical justice and virtue, and ultimately, greater Christian love (or, what else is the ultimate goal of ecumenism?). Or, put another way, growth and participation in *koinonia*, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, becomes embodied and visible as Christian love, by which Christians are to be known (John 13:35), and virtue ethics can help lay the groundwork for liturgical growth in that central mark of discipleship.³⁷ Taking inspiration from works of theological ethics, the final section of this discussion gestures toward some intermediate steps, and guiding norms or principles that may help form them.

Making Good Use of the Gifts

Thus far this discussion has been using the terms justice and virtue very often together, and this final part is the reason I've wanted to keep them both in the mix. To be just and to be virtuous are not exactly the same thing (justice being one of the four cardinal virtues), but to make the best use of the gifts theological ethics can give to liturgical/sacramental theology, some guidelines regarding both justice and virtue are warranted. I take as a model here Margaret Farley's work *Just Love*, a book on sexual ethics in which she develops seven "norms" for sex-

ual justice.³⁸ The impetus for Farley's work is the insight that, if we are to speak about sex and love, then we need also to speak about justice.³⁹ This resonates quite strongly with what I've attempted to argue in this discussion: if we are to speak about liturgy, then we need also to speak about justice and virtue. To do this, this section will gesture in two directions: first, a nod to a theological virtue and cardinal virtue that have already been named as primary for liturgy, and second, a brief development of "norms" for the virtue of justice, liturgically considered.

If for Aristotle the end of virtue was happiness in the good life,⁴⁰ then for this discussion the end of liturgical virtue is "good" liturgy. Or, perhaps more correctly, the end of liturgical virtue is itself a theological virtue, Christian love. For liturgy to be virtuous, it should aim to embody and build up Christian love. Even when it does this imperfectly, it should strive to do this as well as it can, because as Turnbloom points out, the goodness of religious operation depends upon its being carried out *ex caritate*.⁴¹ Following Turnbloom then, to do this well, a primary, formative virtue for liturgical practice must be prudence.⁴² Prudence concerns itself with the particular context of liturgical acts, and as such takes as paramount questions of community history and makeup, who is actually in the pews, and what ethical and religious concerns tend to be primary for this particular liturgical assembly. Put another way, prudence is a pastoral virtue, so any virtuous liturgy should concern itself to be prudent.

To prudence however, I would add the virtue of justice. This cannot be done in isolation from prudence of course, which means Margaret Farley is helpful once again: from the classic definition of justice as "to render to each her or his due," Farley translates the more pastoral, contextual principle that "persons and groups of persons ought to be affirmed according to their concrete reality, actual and potential."⁴³ This is justice, or for Farley, this is what it means to love justly. For liturgy to be just, it should strive to do this as well. Exactly how depends on context and circumstance, but in general, I would suggest the following as norms for practicing this kind of justice liturgically (to be clear, a great many liturgical assemblies do these regularly already; I do not lift these up as glaring current deficiencies, but rather as safeguards against potential liturgical injustice):

(1) *Welcome the stranger*. Beyond its place among the last judgment imagery in Matthew 25, welcoming the stranger makes good, just sense if the head and host of the liturgical celebration is Christ. Additionally, by welcome the stranger I mean more than just putting on a friendly face for unfamiliar faces in the liturgical assembly. To welcome the stranger means also to welcome that which might seem strange about the stranger: customs, liturgical preferences, political convictions, etc. This also does not mean to change the heart of the liturgical assembly to suit the stranger's whims; as in the Benedictine approach to hospitality, this welcome would be for the stranger to be who she or he is, among a community that maintains its identity in welcome.⁴⁴ And, of course, like liturgy more broadly,

the action of welcome is not morally neutral. The very practice of welcome (or at least not ignoring or isolating someone) may include a loving challenge for the newcomer—and the community—to resist sin and tendencies toward it.

(2) *Make vulnerable persons safe.*⁴⁵ Liturgy should never be a place where vulnerable persons fear for their safety, but the realities of oppression can render even settings like liturgy unsafe for some persons or groups. In this reality, even if safety itself is not attainable, solidarity and empowerment can be. This may sometimes mean boldly naming injustice in solidarity with victims or at-risk persons, risking offense to those who might prefer a comforting or confrontation-neutral liturgy. Additionally, while liturgy should be a sanctuary for the vulnerable (to the extent it can), we should not overestimate the power of liturgical celebrations themselves to create safe spaces. Sooner or later the liturgy ends and people go home (or the visitation ends and the pastor leaves), and the situation is out of the ritual hands of the assembly. Liturgy cannot make everything safe and just, but it should at least make itself just and safe for the most vulnerable in the assembly.

(3) *Name current community needs.* The prayers of the faithful can be a powerful reflection of (and insight into) what is important to a community and what is on the assembly's collective mind, but the prayers are not the only place naming the relevant needs of the community. Preaching, hymnody, and liturgical settings each also play their part in emphasizing or de-emphasizing certain aspects of religious and temporal experience, and where justice meets prudence, these attend to what the community needs here and now, rather than what the community leaders might think appears pious.

(4) *Name and reject complacency.* Often enough participants attend liturgy searching for something of an oasis, a place of peace distinct from the concerns of everyday life. I do not mean to denigrate this kind of thirst, so long as it does not reduce liturgy to an opiate. If the liturgical assembly is comfortable and secure, then great care must be taken to guard against complacency, and liturgy should take an active role in this. Complacency in a world broken by sin is just another word for callousness, and to embody justice liturgically, callousness cannot preside. This means both being sensitive to what may be hidden needs in the liturgical assembly itself, and also explicitly calling for justice and works of love to push back suffering caused by sin. Liturgy cannot be only a place for rest; it should also rejuvenate the Christian ethical call.

(5) *Give thanks.* The term eucharist itself suggests this, but the activity of giving thanks to God (and each other) has a just place in liturgical celebration. Even in the context of suffering, some persons or groups may need space to thank and celebrate, and it would be unjust to constrict or obliterate this space.

(6) *Mourn.* Like giving thanks, mourning and lamentation are justly parts of a community's liturgical life, and no liturgy should disregard this. Not every liturgy

needs to rend garments, but no liturgical participant should have her or his sorrows smothered by a rush of communal elation. Not every liturgy needs to dwell on mourning, but to be just, liturgy should at least create genuine space for it.

(7) *Encounter persons, and help them connect.* That liturgy is an essentially communal experience has been amply demonstrated in liturgical/sacramental theology.⁴⁶ However, to be truly communal, liturgy needs more than just a gathering of persons. The persons gathered need to actually encounter one another, in prayer, song, conversation, sharing peace, or any number of other ways to liturgically foster fellowship. In a world where public spaces tend increasingly to be used as occasions to retreat into one's own devices (literal and figurative), liturgy should generally resist this drift toward isolation. I do not mean by this to vilify healthy solitude or seeking silence; I mean rather that without sufficient attention to the communal, even the most well-intentioned seeking of solitude and silence can morph into isolation. Additionally, the justice of encountering each other in our full humanity includes not just a bilateral relationship (I-thou), but also the call to help others connect with one another. If the end of my communal action is only that I am a social hub, I have missed part of what it means to build up the community: it is not just about me-in-the-community. It is about others in the community as well.

(8) *Risk offense, but never for its own sake.* As Kierkegaard famously maintained, faith becomes real by engaging the possibility of offense.⁴⁷ However, not all offense is created equal. The unjust will likely be offended at injustice being named, but the reverse is also true: the righteous may rightly take offense at injustice. There really is very little one can say or do liturgically then, that does not risk offense in any way. Consequently, justice would require that as much as possible, offense should be risked in service to the gospel, in service to love. This is admittedly tricky, because it might be read as giving license to bigotry in the false name of speaking truth. This is the opposite of my intention. Rather, risking offense is exactly the danger that comes along with unveiling things *like* bigotry. Generally speaking, the offense risked should be the offense of the powerful, the comfortable, and the secure. For example, practicing eucharistic fellowship with persons whose views or life situations are difficult theologically (the recent consternation about divorced and remarried couples in Roman Catholicism is one instance, or how churches welcome LGBTQ persons to the altar would be another) can risk offending those who may value perceived theological rigor over liturgical justice. Pastoral judgments are difficult in this exercise, but they are required; In my view, justice largely does not allow for silence while any injustice speaks loudly (and the injustices of our world are blaring). To speak and act liturgically against injustice risks offense, but to remain silent or dodge necessary subjects risks injustice itself.

Given these eight norms for liturgical justice, I would suggest that at least three intermediate steps toward Lutheran-Roman Catholic eucharistic fellowship begin to appear. First, by norms (4), (6), and (8), it may be a good idea to speak

in the very eucharistic prayers themselves (or in some part of the liturgy of the eucharist) of the difficulties of eucharistic fellowship. What is sometimes regulated to bulletin paragraphs, inserts in hymnals, or brief explanations of procedure from the altar could instead be a liturgical acknowledgment of ecclesial movement and recognition. If there is some “real but imperfect”⁴⁸ communion that Christians share across denominations, that would be a good thing to include in the sacrament of communion. Second, norms (1), (2), and (3) would suggest that at special liturgical occasions such as weddings and funerals where there can be special vulnerabilities regarding unity and healing at stake, pastoral judgments of eucharistic fellowship in practice should err on the side of embodied welcome rather than dogmatic rigor. Perhaps this does not mean eucharistic sharing across denominations in all cases, but at the very least the virtue of justice would suggest working liturgically to minimize marring unity or stunting healing. Third and finally, norms (5) and (7) would imply a call to name and give thanks for neighboring Christian communions within the context of liturgy itself. To give thanks for one’s neighbors because of rather than in spite of their religious identity would be a powerful witness to what justice looks like in the service of love. The prayers of the faithful would be one place for this, but perhaps an addition to the sharing of the peace could be another (“Let us share God’s peace with one another, and let us share that peace also with our brothers and sisters of <insert denomination> as we accompany each other on our earthly pilgrimage” or some such statement).

There could be many other (and more creative) concrete intermediate steps on the way to eucharistic fellowship, but in this paper I have argued that as liturgical/sacramental theology works through those steps, it can find a very worthy accomplice in theological ethics, particularly in recognizing the virtue of justice. Where liturgy is just, love has fertile ground in which to take root. Injustice perpetrated in liturgy salts that ground, so liturgical practice (and theology) should take great care to love justice at the altar at least as much as justice in the world.

Notes

1. One notable exception is Margaret A. Farley’s article “No One Goes Away Hungry from the Table of the Lord: Eucharistic Sharing in Ecumenical Contexts,” in James F. Keenan, S.J. and Joseph Kotva, Jr. (eds.), *Practice What You Preach: Virtues, Ethics, and Power in the Lives of Pastoral Ministers and Their Congregations* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1999), 186-201, wherein she argues that so-called “intercommunion” is an ethical issue just as ecclesial division is. However, even in this article the argument demonstrating that view stops short of attending specifically to justice or virtue, or of suggesting intermediate steps toward eucharistic fellowship across Christian denominations.
2. This is not to say in any way that justice and theological ethics have not been categories of discussion in ecumenism. Rather, ecumenical work on justice and theological ethics has tended to focus more on non-liturgical work for justice, or on justice in ecclesiology (see, for example, Lewis S. Mudge, *The Church as Moral Community: Ecclesiology and Ethics in Ecumenical Debate* (New York: Continuum, 1998), especially 129-130).
3. Of course this is not completely absent in liturgical theology, but there remains ample room for development. For some works that do explore this direction, see the essays in Thomas Schattaauer

- (ed.), *Inside Out: Worship in an Age of Mission* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 1999), or R. Kevin Seasoltz, *A Virtuous Church: Catholic Theology, Ethics, and Liturgy for the 21st Century* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2012).
4. Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Declaration on the Way: Church, Ministry, and Eucharist* (http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/ecumenical-and-interreligious/ecumenical/lutheran/upload/Declaration_on_the_Way-for-Website.pdf, accessed 11/25/17), 113.
 5. It would be important to recognize the integral part that Virgil Michel, OSB, and the North American Liturgical Movement played in the development of this perspective on liturgy. See, for example, Virgil Michel's "Natural and Supernatural Society I-V," *Orate Fratres* 10.6-10.10 (April-September, 1936), "Frequent Communion and Social Regeneration," *Orate Fratres* 10.5 (March 1936): 198-202, or "The Parish, Cell of Christian Life," *Orate Fratres* 11.10 (September, 1937): 433-440. Additionally, see Virgil Michel, *Our Life in Christ* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1939) and Virgil Michel, *The Social Question: Essays on Christianity and Capitalism* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1987). Or, for a more overarching view of the development and impact of the North American Liturgical Movement, see Keith Pecklers, *The Unread Vision: The Liturgical Movement in the United States of America 1926-1955* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998).
 6. See Louis-Marie Chauvet, *Symbol and Sacrament* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1994); Don E. Saliers, *Worship as Theology: Foretaste of Glory Divine* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1994); Gordon Lathrop, *Holy Ground: A Liturgical Cosmology* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 2003); Alexander Schmemmann, *Liturgy and Tradition*, ed. Thomas Fisch (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary, 2003); the essays in E. Byron Anderson and Bruce T. Morrill (eds.), *Liturgy and the Moral Self: Humanity at Full Stretch Before God: Essays in Honor of Don E. Saliers* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998); John F. Baldovin (ed.), *Robert Hovda: The Amen Corner* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1994). Additionally, see Gordon Lathrop, *Holy Things: A Liturgical Theology* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1993), Bruce Morrill, *Anamnesis as Dangerous Memory* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000), and the essays in Doris Donnelly (ed.), *Sacraments and Justice* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2014).
 7. M. Shawn Copeland, *Enfleshing Freedom* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2010), 107-128.
 8. William Cavanaugh, *Torture and Eucharist* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1998), 203-281.
 9. As in Gordon Lathrop, *Holy Things* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1993): 161-225.
 10. As in Theresa F. Koernke, "Toward an Ethics of Liturgical Behavior," *Worship* 66.1 (Jan. 1992): 25-38.
 11. As in John D. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary, 2002), 143-157.
 12. One can see this quite clearly in documents such as *Declaration on the Way, From Conflict to Communion* (The Lutheran World Federation and the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt GmbH, 2013), and the joint statement of the Lutheran World Federation and the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity written for the end of the year of commemoration (https://www.lutheranworld.org/sites/default/files/2017/joint_statement_lwf-pcpcu_-_en.pdf, accessed 11/25/17).
 13. One can see this at least implicitly when one considers common reasons for people to give up attending liturgy. For example, when the Barna Group surveyed millennials who quit going to church (millennials are currently the largest unchurched age group in the U.S.), the reasons given were split fairly evenly between three: church's irrelevance, hypocrisy, and the moral failings of its leaders (<https://www.barna.com/research/americans-divided-on-the-importance-of-church/#.UzwMlq1dW7o>, accessed 11/18/2017). These are not just outside reasons for falling away from liturgy; they are aspects of church life that can be embedded in liturgy itself, even and especially by absence of acknowledgment.
 14. Perhaps to be fair, we should note that most (all?) liturgies in fact do both of these simultaneously in different ways.
 15. Lamentation in liturgy can be a tricky thing in response to injustice, but a worthwhile engagement

- of this question (applied to the injustice of racism) appears in Brian Massingale, *Racial Justice and the Catholic Church* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2010), 83-129.
16. I use the term “calling out” here intentionally, because so-called “call-out culture” has a vivid recent history in movements for justice, both for good and for ill. See, for example, Asam Ahmad, “A Note on Call Out Culture” (<https://briarpatchmagazine.com/articles/view/a-note-on-call-out-culture>, accessed 11/26/17), or Conor Friedersdorf, “The Destructiveness of Call Out Culture on Campus,” *The Atlantic*, May 8, 2017, <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2017/05/call-out-culture-is-stressing-out-college-students/524679/> (accessed 11/26/17). Within the context of liturgy, calling-out might look like a prophetic call, or it might look like a divisive attack (or likely a mixture of both, depending on the observers and participants). This is where the pastoral application of theological-ethical approaches to liturgy would be paramount.
 17. This problem is of course hardly peculiar to theology. Contemporary professional academics can often fall into competing ivory towers if the process of striving is not addressed before it devolves into strife, but nevertheless distinction between disciplines bears many gifts to academic endeavor. Two good discussions of this appear in Jerry A. Jacobs, “Why The Disciplines Still Matter,” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 27, 2014, <https://www.chronicle.com/article/Why-the-Disciplines-Still/146777> (accessed 11/28/2017), and Edward Burger, “The Importance of Undisciplined Thinking,” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Sept. 4, 2012, <https://www.chronicle.com/article/The-Importance-of/134032> (accessed 11/28/2017).
 18. Wherein the priest and the Levite are portrayed as passing by the man in need on the other side of the road, presumably to preserve ritual purity for participation in some set of religious practices.
 19. The reverse would be true as well (that theological ethics has no good reason to ignore liturgical/sacramental theology), but that would be the subject of another discussion altogether.
 20. Copeland, *Enfleshing Freedom*, 107-121.
 21. Katie Walker Grimes, *Christ Divided: Antiblackness as Corporate Vice* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2017), 189-222.
 22. One ought to note here that virtue ethics itself has enjoyed a relatively recent resurgence of popularity in theological ethics. See, for example, Jean Porter, *The Recovery of Virtue: The Relevance of Aquinas for Christian Ethics* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1990), or Joseph J. Kotva, Jr., *The Christian Case for Virtue Ethics* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University, 1996).
 23. Lisa Tessman, *Burdened Virtues: Virtue Ethics for Liberatory Struggles* (New York: Oxford University, 2005), 4.
 24. *Ibid.*, 15. See also Claudia Card, *The Unnatural Lottery: Character and Moral Luck* (Philadelphia, PA: Templeton University, 1996).
 25. For a discussion of the “triple body,” see Chauvet, *Symbol and Sacrament*, 149-151.
 26. Or, to invoke the Greek origin of the term, if they *sin* (ἁμαρτία).
 27. Eduardo Bonilla-Silva, *Racism Without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in America* (Plymouth, UK: Rowman and Littlefield, 2014).
 28. It is interesting to note that in the wake of sexual abuse crises in the church, one set of responses has been to argue for models of “ecclesial professional ethics,” recognizing that moral failures by church professionals both hurt communities and have thus far gone relatively unaddressed theologically (see James F. Keenan, “Toward an Ecclesial Professional Ethics,” in Jean M. Bartunek, Mary Ann Hinsdale, and James F. Keenan, *Church Ethics and Its Organizational Context: Learning from the Sex Abuse Scandal in the Catholic Church* (New York: Rowman and Littlefield, 2006), 83-96.).
 29. One could legitimately object at this point, to the idea that liturgy is *only* about developing human relationships, as opposed to also deepening individuals’ and communities’ relationships with God. I have intentionally minimized the vertical aspect of liturgy in favor of the horizontal in this discussion, in an effort to throw into sharper relief what is at stake in ethical (or unethical) liturgical practice.
 30. As I said above, some of this is necessary, but it is not the endgame.
 31. Of which the accounts can be truly inspiring. See, for example, Nile Harper, *Journeys Into Justice: Religious Collaborations Working for Social Transformation* (Minneapolis, MN: Bascom Hill, 2009).

32. Benjamin Durheim and David Farina Turnbloom, "Tactical Ecumenism." *Theological Studies* 76.2 (June 2015): 311-329.
33. Though, I suppose I would not want to denigrate the possibility of increased camaraderie in discovering shared ice cream tastes. Good ice cream can be a balm with few equals.
34. *Declaration on the Way*, 113.
35. Many great moments in ecumenism, like the Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification, recognize in themselves the intermediate nature of their identity (The Lutheran World Federation and the Catholic Church, http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/documents/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_31101999_cath-luth-joint-declaration_en.html, accessed 11/25/17). They begin and continue conversations; rarely if ever do they end them.
36. Tessman, 31.
37. This confluence of the horizontal and vertical aspects of liturgy certainly warrants more discussion, but runs beyond the scope of our central aim here.
38. Margaret Farley, *Just Love: A Framework for Christian Sexual Ethics* (New York: Continuum, 2006).
39. *Ibid.*, 200-201.
40. See especially Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. Christopher Rowe (Oxford: Oxford University, 2002), Books I, II, III.
41. David Farina Turnbloom, *Speaking With Aquinas: A Conversation about Grace, Virtue, and the Eucharist* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2017), 142.
42. *Ibid.*, 143-154.
43. Farley, *Just Love*, 208-209.
44. See chapter 53 of Saint Benedict's *Rule of Benedict* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1981). Further developing this conversation with Benedictine approaches to hospitality would be worthwhile, but beyond the scope of the current discussion.
45. I am aware that language of "safety" can be dicey, especially when speaking about persons and groups for whom existence is nearly always marked by oppression and marginalization. There may be a better way to speak about this function of liturgical justice (solidarity? empowerment?), but for now, I find myself returning to language of safety, even if this can only be achieved partially.
46. See, as two examples, Lathrop's *Holy Things* or Chauvet's *Symbol and Sacrament*.
47. While Kierkegaard alludes to this in many places, a developed argument for this appears in Søren Kierkegaard, *Practice in Christianity*, eds./trans. Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University, 1991), 75-100.
48. Second Vatican Council, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19641121_unitatis-redintegratio_en.html (accessed 11/22/17), 3.

What's in a Name? Pronouns and Titles for God in the 2017 CCLI Top 100

Taylor W. Burton-Edwards

As a member of “Exploring Contemporary and Alternative Worship” with the North American Academy of Liturgy (2006-present), and particularly as the creator of the CCLI Top 100 Vetting Project¹ of The United Methodist Church (2015-present), I have become intimately familiar with the forms of Christian congregational song mostly commonly referred to as “contemporary” or “modern” worship music. In the process of reviewing these songs for theology, language, and singability over the past three years, I noticed they seemed to use pronouns and titles for God in ways that were somewhat different than might have been the case in what is often referred to as “traditional” worship music, or “hymnody.” In general, I noticed a high rate of second person address to God, a high frequency of songs that tended to focus exclusively on the second person of the Trinity, and an unusual number of songs that addressed God with both second and third person pronouns within the same song.

As I was noticing these apparent phenomena, I began to wonder what could be learned by documenting all uses of pronouns and titles for God within a sample of widely used songs. How would such general observations be sustained, corrected, or nuanced by a more careful analysis? What else might be learned about the songs, and potentially about the congregations who sing them?

This essay is the result of my comprehensive analysis of the use of pronouns and titles for God in the spring 2017 CCLI Top 100.²

What Is the CCLI Top 100 and Why Does It Matter?

CCLI stands for Christian Copyright Licensing International.³ CCLI is the leading provider of licenses for congregations to reproduce copyrighted music for congregational singing. Over 250,000 churches worldwide, approximately 150,000 of them in the US and Canada, hold CCLI licenses.⁴ By comparison, the Hartford Institute for Religious Research estimates there are 350,000 congregations of all types in the United States, including 314,000 Protestant churches (primary base of CCLI users), 24,000 Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches, and

12,000 non-Christian congregations.⁵ The three largest Protestant bodies in Canada (United Church of Canada, Anglican Church of Canada, Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada) comprise approximately 5000 congregations.⁶ These figures indicate a sizeable percentage of all US and Canadian Christian congregations are CCLI subscribers. By contrast, the next largest licensing company, primarily serving mainline Protestant and Roman Catholic congregations offering “traditional” worship, is OneLicense, with 14,000 subscribers in the US.⁷

Every six months, CCLI license holders are required to submit a list of all songs covered under the CCLI license which their congregations have used in worship. From this reporting, CCLI generates its “Top” lists twice yearly, typically released in April (spring) and October (Fall) reflecting which songs have been most reported as being used in the congregations in a given country or region. CCLI also generates a separate “Top 10 Trending Songs” list on a weekly basis driven by weekly download data from subscribers to its SongSelect service. The CCLI Top 100 list, representing usage over six month periods, remains fairly stable over time, with 10 to 15 new songs entering it on average from year to year since 2015 and some rearrangement in the rankings.⁸ This study uses the spring CCLI Top 100 for the United States and Canada as accessed in May 2017.

The CCLI Top 100 matters as an indication of the songs most likely to be in use in worship services primarily in evangelical churches and mainline churches that offer contemporary worship services. Southern Baptists (evangelical, about 20,000 subscribing churches), United Methodists (mainline and evangelical, nearly 16,000 subscribing churches) and Assemblies of God (Pentecostal, around 10000 subscribing churches) are the top three denominations in the CCLI user base in the United States and Canada. Just over 3,000 Roman Catholic churches, many of them connected with the Life Teen Youth Movement, are also subscribers.⁹ The vast majority of songs in the Top 100 would be classified as “contemporary” or “modern” worship music.¹⁰

If what we sing most frequently in worship both reflects and shapes what we believe or come to believe about God, as Leonel Mitchell and others have long noted¹¹, then attending to the most frequently used copyrighted songs in the United States and Canada from the most frequently used licensing company may also provide some indication about how congregations singing these songs may be reflecting and forming the understanding and experience of God many Christians in the United States and Canada may be having at a given point in time.

Research using CCLI’s reporting is not unprecedented. Lester Ruth has been a pioneer in collecting the CCLI Top 25 lists (a smaller CCLI reporting project begun in the 1989) and analyzing the theology of the songs found in them. An early example of this work is found in Ruth’s essay, “The Trinity in Contemporary Worship Music” in *The Message in the Music: Studying Contemporary*

Praise and Worship, the first book released containing scholarly assessment of this body of worship music.¹² That essay and my continuing work with Ruth as part of the CCLI Top 100 Vetting Project are foundational in my analysis of Trinitarian address in this essay. Other recent works using CCLI lists include Ruth's essay, "Some Similarities and Differences between Historic Evangelical Hymns and Contemporary Worship Songs"¹³ and Michael A. Tapper's 2017 volume, *Canadian Pentecostals, The Trinity, and Contemporary Worship Music: The Things We Sing*¹⁴ (Boston: Brill, 2017). My research in this essay is distinctive for using a larger selection of songs (the CCLI Top 100 list), asking a more specific set of questions (pronouns and titles for God have not been previously catalogued in this way), and assessing the possible theological and business effects of the virtual monopoly Capitol Records holds in the current market.

Overall, my analysis finds both liturgical and musical warrants for the rise and uses of what I call "hybrid address songs" and the ways these may represent a shift in the construction of worship sets in contemporary/modern worship settings. It also raises critical concerns about the entire absence of feminine language for God, the dominance of "King" as non-divine metaphor for God, and the stability of the contemporary/modern worship music market.

Methodology

For every song in the CCLI Top 100 I collected the following data: song title, composer(s), publisher(s), publication date, the number of third person pronouns addressing God, the person or persons of the Trinity addressed in the song, the number of masculine pronouns for God, the number of feminine pronouns for God, the number of gender neutral pronouns for God, names or titles used to describe God (third person address), the number of each masculine name for God, the number of each feminine name for God, the number of each gender neutral name for God (I counted "God" as gender neutral for this study)¹⁵, the number of second person pronouns for God, the names for God in second person address, the number of each masculine name for God, the number of each feminine name for God, the number of each gender neutral name for God (again counting "God" as gender neutral), and the tempo of the song, all based on its score in CCLI's SongSelect service. This service provides musical scores, lyrics, lead sheets, vocal scores, and samples from recorded performances for many of the songs included in the CCLI catalog.

I recorded this data in an Excel™ spreadsheet, printed it in full, and assembled it into a 3 × 14 grid of 42 sheets of 8 ½" × 11" paper in landscape mode. I then used the printed spreadsheet to make tallies of specific queries by hand, using the Find feature in Excel as a backup to ensure I did not skip instances of occurrences of specific search terms in a specific query. The mixed nature of the data made purely electronic queries impossible to perform in the software available to me.

Queries and Findings

Forms of Address to God in the CCLI Top 100

I first wanted to determine how many songs in the Top 100 had second person only, third person only, or both second and third person address to God. The results validated my general observation that it seemed there was a high instance of songs including either second person address or second and third person address in combination (which I hereafter call “hybrid address”). 38 songs included exclusively second person address. 22 were exclusively third person. 40 used both second and third person address. Overall, 78 of the Top 100 songs included second person address, and hybrid address songs slightly eclipsed second person only songs in this category. The data confirm my general impression that second person address to God is the dominant form of expression in this corpus of congregational song.

I further examined the publication dates for all hybrid address songs and found that within the Top 100, the preponderance of these songs (35/40, or 87.5%) were published since 2005. This may indicate either that the sub-genre of hybrid address songs is relatively new (since 2005), or that the congregations using these songs tend to use only those published since 2005. At the very least, the data strongly suggest that hybrid address song is generally a newer phenomenon in the use of Christian congregational song.

Leading Publishers Represented

Since beginning the CCLI Top 100 Vetting Project in 2015 that a large number of songs seemed to be from a fairly limited group of publishers. In the process of documenting publishers in this project, I investigated each publisher individually and discovered the number of publishers was even smaller than it may appear, as many of the leading publishing labels in contemporary/modern worship music have become brands of a single publisher/distributor/administrator, Capitol Records, over the past two decades.

Indeed, Capitol CMG and its related sub-brands are involved in the publication of 78 of the spring 2017 CCLI Top 100 songs. This includes but is not limited to Hillsong (17), Thankyou (15), sixsteps (13), Integrity (9), Thankyou and sixsteps (both credited, 7), Capitol CMG (6), Word (2) and Brentwood/Benson (2).¹⁶ Bethel Music¹⁷ comes in second (8), and Elevation Worship¹⁸ is third (5). The remaining 9 publishers represented in this listing have exactly one song each. I will discuss a variety of implications of a single publisher exercising a virtual monopoly in the most used songs in Christian worship in the United States later in this essay. But this observation also led me to further queries about the whether the data about pronouns and titles for God could establish a distinctive “Capitol Records Effect” on the music being published, or whether the brands within the overall Capitol Records umbrella seemed to exercise a measure of distinctiveness.

I proceeded to look at two pronoun/title related questions in relation to specific publishing brands first within the Capitol Records umbrella and then by comparison to Bethel Music and Elevation Worship, the other two leading publishers. First, I looked at primary (top three) titles for God. Then I documented by publisher which person or persons of the Trinity were addressed in these songs, including whether there were signs of “Trinitarian Collapse.” “Trinitarian Collapse” refers to instances where attributes most typically ascribed by scripture or orthodox Christian theology to a particular person of the Trinity (most often the First or Third Person) are instead ascribed in the song to another (most commonly in this literature to the Second).¹⁹ If substantial commonalities could be found across the leading Capitol brands on these two questions, and these were *substantially* different than what could be found in the other two leading brands (Bethel Music and Elevation Worship), there could be some evidence, at a textual level, of a “Capitol Records Effect” across its brands.

Sub-query 1: Publishers and Titles for God

For both of these sub-queries, I first considered the Capitol Records sub-brands Hillsong, Thankyou, sixsteps, Thankyou/sixsteps collaborations, Capitol CMG, and Integrity. I identified the top three names or titles for God appearing for each sub-brand. Across these six sub-brands, the most frequently recurring top-three titles for God, in order of occurrence, were God (174), Lord (168), Jesus (106), King (8), and I Am (13, unique to Integrity, and appearing multiple times in a single song). However, for no single brand did these appear in the same order of frequency. For Hillsong, for example, the order of frequency was Lord (66), Jesus (38), God (18). For sixsteps and Thankyou collaborations, however, it was God (89), Lord (15), and King (1). Similar levels of dissimilarity can be observed across all six. It would appear that within these Capitol brands, there is not a discernible Capitol Records Effect on the frequency of titles for addressing God.

If there can be said to be any Capitol Records Effect on this kind of content, then, it might would be found at the level of the collective of Capitol Records songs as opposed to those of other leading publishers. Here, there is some contrast to be noted. For Bethel Music, the top three titles for God are Jesus (26), King (17), and Lamb (9). Lamb does not appear in the Capitol collective. For Elevation Worship it is King (39), God (20), and Jesus (7). While King also appears twice as a “top 3” title for God in the Capitol Records collective, as noted above, its total occurrence is 23, 11 across 13 songs in sixsteps (85%, though not a top three title for this publisher), 7 across 6 songs in Capitol CMG (117%), and 5 across 15 songs in Thankyou (33%). Across Bethel Music and Elevation Worship, it is 46 across 13 total songs (354%). If there is any Capitol Records Effect here, it may be in “damping” the use of King as a title for God. However, there is not enough evidence here to demonstrate any actual effect.

Thus, while Capitol appears to have a significantly outsized impact on the marketing that may generate interest and usage in the Top 100 songs, it does not appear

to be having any marked effect on the use of pronouns or titles addressing God. Each sub-brand, including Capitol CMG, appears to have its own distinctive approach. Differences between Capitol and the other publishers on the frequency of King may be as easily explained by the specific and theological commitments of Bethel Music (Pentecostal)²⁰ and Elevation Worship (Reformed)²¹.

*Sub-query 2: Publishers and Trinitarian Considerations
Regarding Address to God*

In this sub-query, I documented by publisher (column one) the number of songs addressing the various Persons of the Trinity and which Persons or combination of persons were addressed (succeeding columns). By far, across all publishers, the Second Person was not only the most addressed, but most frequently the only addressed within a given song (59 songs).

Hillsong, which also has the most songs of all brands in the Top 100 with 17, had 13 songs addressing only the Second Person. It had no songs addressing only the First Person, and two addressing both the First and Second. It also had no songs addressing exclusively the Third Person, but one song addressing the Second and Third Persons, and one song addressing all three Persons. Three songs out of the 17 included some form of Trinitarian collapse, typically of the First Person onto the Second.

Thankyou, a close second to Hillsong with 15 songs in the Top 100, had a distinctively different profile. Six of its songs, more than any other brand by at least half, were addressed exclusively to the First Person. It was the only publisher with fewer songs addressed to the Second Person, at five. It had one song each addressed to both First and Second or First and Third, two addressed to Second and Third (also the most in the collection), and five (tied with Bethel Music in number, though not percentage) reflecting Trinitarian collapse.

sixsteps reflects the more typical pattern across all Capitol sub-brands *and* other major publishers, with more songs addressing the second than the first person, and at least one song addressing two or more (in this case, one song addressing all three) Persons of the Trinity.

Overall, the data show the same general patterns of primary sole address to the Second Person (whether in second or third person pronouns), one or more songs (though in different distributions) with some address to one or more other Persons, and some Trinitarian collapse across all brands. Elevation Worship had the highest rate of songs with Trinitarian collapse (3 of 5, 60%). If there is a Capitol Records Effect on Trinitarian address, it is evident neither among the Capitol sub-brands, nor by comparing Capitol sub-brands, as a collective, to Bethel Music and Elevation Worship.

Overall, then, Capitol Records does not appear to exert a particular effect on the persons of the Trinity being addressed in the spring 2017 CCLI Top 100, apart from reinforcing what appears to be a primary focus on the second person across all leading publishers.

Most Dominant non-God/Lord/Jesus Titles for God

The most common title for God across the entire collection other than God, Lord, and Jesus, is “King” (108 instances total in 100 songs). 39 of these appeared in just two songs from Elevation Worship, 17 in three songs from Bethel Music, 12 across four songs from Hillsong, and 9 across four songs from sixsteps (11 across all 13). This means that while the title King is more common in the non-Capitol corpus, it is also substantially present in two of the leading Capitol brands, so that it is a pervasive metaphor regardless of brand. The second most pervasive non-divine title after King is “Lamb,” with 17 instances in Bethel Music’s songs. The gap between King and Lord (108 versus 17), is so significant that it may be said that “King” is the controlling metaphor²² for thinking about God across this corpus.

Gender of God in the Top 100

It is a common practice when editing older, non-inclusive texts, to change third person masculine address to second person address for the purpose of achieving a potentially less exclusive text. Given the high number of songs in this collection with second person address to God (78), I wondered, initially, whether movements toward inclusive or expansive language may have had some influence on the writing of these songs. The data were clear. All pronominal references to God were either second person or third person masculine or gender neutral. There were zero feminine pronominal references to God. Likewise, all titles for God were either masculine or gender neutral, zero feminine. The 38 second person address songs used masculine titles or names for God (including Lord, Jesus, and King, among a few others) 127 times, and gender neutral titles or names for God (including God) 122 times. The 40 hybrid address songs included 459 masculine names or titles for God and 272 gender neutral names or titles for God (including God). The 22 third person address songs included 334 masculine names or titles for God and 151 gender neutral references (here including both God and 15 instances of “Jehovah” in a single song; arguably the name Jehovah could be considered masculine). My conclusion from these data is that the high incidence of second person address across these songs reflects little or no influence of the movements toward inclusive or expansive language, and instead reflects the use of the second person simply to promote a sense of intimacy between the worshiper and a God who is primarily and predominantly understood in terms of masculine metaphors.

Tempo and Worship in the Top 100

In the development of “worship sets” as part of what Lester Ruth and Swee Hong Lim have referred to as the “Praise and Worship Movement,” it was often common for a collection of songs at the beginning of a worship service to start with faster

songs of thanksgiving or praise, then move toward one or more slower songs of intimate worship of God.²³ These slower worship songs typically have two defining characteristics, a tempo of around 80 bpm or less, and a predominance of second person pronouns directly addressing God.

Within the spring 2017 CCLI Top 100, 19 of the 38 (50%) of the second person songs fit the tempo range of a worship song (~80 bpm or less), while 28 of the 40 (70%) hybrid address songs (songs that include both second and third person address of God) fit that pattern. Only 9 of the 22 (41%) of the third person songs fit the tempo of a worship song.

Typologies of Hybrid Address Songs

The rise of the hybrid address song, especially since 2005 within this group of songs, may seem to be a sign that songwriters are becoming less coherent, perhaps even sloppy, in their address of God through pronouns. In most instances, and with only a few exceptions, however, I observed that the shift in address of God tends to correspond to shifts in musical sections within a given hybrid address song. In some cases, this means the verses and chorus may be third person, while the bridge is second person, or vice versa.

In looking more closely at musical structure and what the text is doing in relationship to musical structure, I have developed five typologies to categorize the ways in which hybrid songs use pronominal address to God.

Some of these hybrid songs are worship songs in tempo with primarily second person address throughout. A good example is “The Stand” (77 BPM, Joel Houston, © 2005 Hillsong Music Publishing). In one part of the chorus (not even the whole of the chorus), there is a shift to third person address in the line, “So I’ll stand with arms high and heart abandoned, in awe of the One who gave it all.” This happens specifically and only in the chorus, so is bounded within a specific musical unit of the song. This shift to third person address marks a shift in the position of worshiper from one who has encountered God in worship (elsewhere in the song) to one who now testifies to what has happened or will happen as a result of the encounter. It is not unlike what happens in a number of Psalms of lament, which conclude with testimony to the assembly about how God has responded to the psalmist’s plea. I refer to songs of this type as “Worship with Testimony.”

A second type of hybrid address worship song in this collection is typified by “Even So, Come” (Chris Tomlin, © 2015 S.D.G Publishing, Sixsteps Songs, Worship Together Music, Open Hands Music, So Essential Tunes, Chrissamsongs Inc, Go Mia Music, Vistaville Music). It is a worship song (quarter note tempo of 81 bpm), mostly in second person address, except verse 1, which is in third person address to God and second person address to the singing congregation. The function of this third person address is to prepare or exhort the congregation to

start singing more emphatically and then intimately on the chorus. It is not uncommon performance practice in this genre for the first verse and/or pre-chorus to be sung by a soloist.²⁴ So the function is not unlike that of the opening dialog in a standard Eucharistic prayer which exhorts the congregation to “Lift up your hearts... Let us give thanks to the Lord, our God” and then continues with second person address to God (most typically to the first person of the Trinity) for the rest of the prayer. I refer to songs of this type as “Worship with Exhortation.” “10000 Reasons” (Jonas Myrin and Matt Redman, © 2011 Atlas Mountain Songs) is an example of a third type of hybrid address song. The tempo is too fast for a worship song (96 BPM), so it does not function as a worship song within an opening set. It would fit earlier in the typical worship set, either near the beginning or middle. Its most memorable and most repeated part is the chorus with which the song also begins, “Bless the Lord, O my soul, O my soul, worship His holy name.” The song thus starts by being exhortatory in function, then continues with a shift to second person worship, which is then continued in all of its verses. I refer to songs of this type as “Exhortation or Testimony with Worship.”

Since US copyright law covers nearly all songs published from 1923 to the present, there are consistently several hymns included in the CCLI Top 100. One of these, “How Great Thou Art” (Stuart Hine, © 1949 and 1953 Stuart Hine Trust CIO and Stuart K. Jine Trust) is one of the five pre-2005 examples of hybrid address song in the spring 2017 CCLI Top 100. In tempo it is a worship song (SongSelect BPM 60). In its verses, it includes both worship (2nd person address, stanzas 1 and the end of 4) and testimony (3rd person address, stanzas 2, 3, and the bulk of 4) in its verses, and what might be called “testimonial worship” (“Then sings my soul, my Savior God to thee”) in the chorus. Songs of this type might be called “Hymns with Testimony and Worship.”

Finally, there are a few hybrid songs in the spring 2017 CCLI Top 100 that do not seem to have structural, or functional, or sound textual reasons for shifting address where they do. “How He Loves Us” (John Mark McMillan, © 2005 Integrity’s Hosanna! Music) is a case in point. Verse 1 begins with third person address as testimony (“He is jealous for me”), then toward the end of the verse shifts to second person address (“I realize just how beautiful you are”). If this were going to signal or segue into a pre-chorus in second person address, this shift of address within the verse might have been reasonable. Instead, the pre-chorus immediately follows in third person address (“O, how He loves us so”). I refer to songs such as these as “Songs with Inconsistent Address” I found three of the 40 hybrid address songs fitting this category.²⁵

Possible Trends and Conclusions

A Shift in the Construction of Music Sets in Contemporary/Modern Worship
As previously noted, the “traditional” pattern of constructing a worship set had been to move from faster to slower songs, and from songs with third person ad-

dress to songs of more intimate second person address to God. We've already noted that the percentage and number of hybrid address songs that fit the tempo of worship songs (28, or 70%) outpaces that of single purpose worship songs (19, or 50%). This indicates that within the spring 2017 reporting period, at least, congregations were using substantially more hybrid songs than dedicated worship songs.

Looking at the years of publication of songs whose tempo and inclusion of second person address could classify them as "worship songs" reveals what may be a trend and a possible shift in how the traditional "worship set" is being constructed. Of the 19 second person songs that were worship songs, the median year of publication was between 2009 and 2010. Of the 28 hybrid worship songs, the median year was one year later, between 2010 and 2011. That shift of only one year may not seem remarkable. It becomes more remarkable, however, when considering the previously noted phenomenon of the dramatically larger number of hybrid address songs in the CCLI Top 100 published since versus before 2005 (35 versus 5), and that of all songs prior to 2010/2011, 65% were worship songs (hybrid or single purpose), while afterward 78.1% of all songs were hybrid address worship songs. This means hybrid address songs not only represent the plurality of all songs in the spring 2017 CCLI Top 100, but since 2010/2011 the subset of these songs which fit the tempo requirements for worship songs (around 80 BPM or less) are the dominant form of all songs making the list. This may suggest that hybrid address worship songs may be starting to replace "traditional" worship songs to generate the "worship moments" of opening worship sets.

Let me make an observation that suggests how that may be happening, and then, from a musician's perspective, a suggestion about why it may be happening. How it is happening is based on the typical musical structure of these songs, and indeed of most contemporary worship songs making the Top 100 published since Chris Tomlin's "How Great Is Our God" in 2004 (© 2004 sixsteps Music, worshiptogether.com songs, Wondrously Made Songs). Starting with "How Great Is Our God", the formerly dominant verse-chorus of praise and worship music has been replaced by an increasingly complex structure of verse-chorus-bridge, and later verse-pre-chorus-chorus-bridge- and occasionally coda.²⁶ The performance practice facilitated by this change in musical structure has shifted as well. The earlier verse-chorus structure, also shared with many hymns and gospel songs from the 19th and earlier 20th centuries, followed a general performance sequence of verse to chorus and back again, often with the chorus repeated multiple times as the song was coming to its close.²⁷

The performance practice in the verse-pre-chorus-chorus-bridge-[coda] structure, however, is much more fluid. The various elements of the same song may be performed in a variety of different orders depending on how it fits within the worship set and what the song is intended to do within that set. While a verse (V) or perhaps two verses typically begin such songs, followed by pre-chorus

(PC) and chorus (C) the addition of a sung bridge (B), plus the occasional coda (Co) has allowed for a much greater freedom in the way these various distinct musical elements of these songs are ordered or repeated in their performance. For example, a fairly straightforward performance of Joh Mark and Sarah McMillan's "King of My Heart" (© 2015 Meaux Jeux Music, Raucous Ruckus Publishing, McMillan, Sarah) as documented in its SongSelect score is V1/C/V2/C/B/B/C/C/ Instrumental/Coda/Coda. But in her live performance (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EpgSbKYxd9Y>) the structure is V1/C/V2/C/B/B/C/C overlaid with B/ Instrumental/Coda/C/C overlaid with coda/C/C. The effect is not only to lead into a moment of intimate worship with the initial coda (in the form of third person testimony, coming out of the worshipful chorus), but to stretch it out and sustain it by continuing after the coda with more renditions of the chorus occasionally interlaced with the coda.²⁸

Along with the increased flexibility of the musical performance, the increase in the number of distinct musical sections within a song opens the possibility for different sections to perform different kinds of functions within the same song, and sometimes even within the same section (such as within a verse, chorus, or bridge, as we've noted above with "The Stand"), all without creating any sense of disjunction in meaning or musical flow. The result is these more complex and hybrid address songs may be beginning to replace single-purpose worship songs in worship sets.

Why is there an apparent confluence in the increased musical complexity of these songs (since 2004) and in the popularity of hybrid address songs since 2005, leading in turn to what may be the use of hybrid address songs to replace single-purpose worship songs within worship sets? Let me suggest a musical reason for both. A great worship band can make segues between songs fairly seamlessly. Most congregations do not have a great worship band, but rather an adequate one, for whom such transitions are a much greater challenge. With hybrid address songs, it is possible for even an adequate worship band to make the segue from third to second person address, and back again, within a single song, by alternating elements already in the score, and do so without skipping a beat or needing to create other forms of bridging as they would have to between single purpose songs.

If indeed the hybrid address song is here to stay, and if, as I suggest, these songs may be replacing single purpose worship songs in song sets, we may discover over time that the length of a typical worship set may stay about the same in terms of time, while the number of songs in a typical worship set becomes smaller, as the length of the songs in it, especially the hybrid address songs, may become longer.

Hymn Remakes

It has not been uncommon for some observers of contemporary worship music over the past decade or two to say that traditional hymnody is making a significant

inroad into contemporary worship music.²⁹ Does the spring 2017 CCLI Top 100 support this hypothesis?

Of that Top 100 list, 10 songs could be classified as remakes in some form. Three of them are remakes of the same hymn, “Amazing Grace.” Two are second person, four third person, and four hybrid by adding a new chorus or a bridge to an otherwise third person hymn text. The publication dates of these songs range from 1996-2014, with a median at 2010, and the latest two in 2014. Three were published on the same album by the same artist (Chris Tomlin, 2006). What can we conclude from these data?

There are five remakes published between since 2010 on the spring 2017 CCLI Top 100, out of 39 total songs (12.8%). Put another way 87.2% of all songs in the Top 100 published since 2010 are not hymn remakes. Original texts remain by far the most dominant format in this sample. At best, hymn remakes may represent an important niche in contemporary worship music or congregational singing, but not yet a definitive movement.

Possible Reasons for and the Effect of “King” as Controlling Metaphor for God

As noted earlier, “King” is by far the most commonly used non-divine name or title for God appearing in the spring 2017 CCLI Top 100. The 106 instances of this title include 26 songs. Of these 10 were published since 2012, and 6 of these is 2015 and 2016 alone. This indicates not just a pervasive use of the title across publishers, but indeed what may be an increasing use in songs being published and sung by congregations in more recent years. What might this mean?

When I’ve sought crowd-sourced answers to this question in my constituencies (largely mainline and evangelical United Methodists), the most typical hypotheses for the high rate of use of this title are that it rhymes well, or that it may reflect an increase in interest in the kingdom of God as an idea within evangelical theology. However, the songs themselves bear out neither of these hypotheses. Most contemporary worship music does not include any sort of rhyming scheme. And the references to king in the CCLI Top 100, with one notable exception (Rend Collective’s “Build Your Kingdom Here,” © 2011 Thankyou Music) never mention the kingdom of God. They simply refer to Jesus as “My King” or “King.”

What seems to correlate most closely is an overall theology in the lyrics that centers on the power (Pentecostal) or sovereignty/control (Reformed) of God (more specifically, Jesus). The song that includes “King” most frequently is Elevation Worship’s “Resurrecting” (Steven Furtick, Chris Brown, Mack Brock, Wade Joye, Matthew Ntlele, © 2015 Elevation Worship Publishing). King appears here 28 times in a “straight” performance based on the SongSelect score. Elevation Worship is the band of a Southern Baptist multi-campus megachurch with strong Re-

formed theology. The second highest incidence in a single song is “This Is Amazing Grace” (15 times, Phil Wickham, Jeremy Riddle, Josh Farro, © 2012 Phil Wickham Music, Seems Like Music, Sing My Songs, WB Music Corp., Bethel Music Publishing). These musicians comprise the band of Bethel Church, an independent Pentecostal megachurch. Within the Capitol Records sub-brands, the most frequent ascriptions come from Hillsong (12 times across 4 songs) and sixsteps (11 times across 5 songs, including collaborations with Thankyou). Hillsong is also generally Pentecostal in theology. sixsteps (Chris Tomlin is the primary songwriter) is generally Reformed in theology.

Why do worship leaders choose songs whose controlling “non-divine” metaphor for God is King, and what is the effect of these choices on those who sing them? Let me begin by suggesting the motive may relate to the influence of scripture. As Lester Ruth has noted, these songs and songwriters, who continue in their own way within the historical vein of evangelical songwriting, may well be directly or indirectly influenced by the Psalms, where King is also a very common non-divine metaphor for God, if not the most common one.³⁰ For the songwriters, and those who share their theological heritages then, King is a fine and scriptural image.

A second possible motive may be a popularity effect. These songs may be chosen in part because their composers are popular, trusted worship leaders and their tunes are singable enough for the band and congregation to use, without much if any regard for whether their theology aligns well with that of their congregations, or for what the effect of the theology of the songs might be on their congregations.³¹

Be that as it may, we can and should consider the effects of the dominance of this non-divine title for God on the congregations who sing these songs at high rates. The theologies of these popular worship song writers underwrites understandings of God in terms of power or control (sovereignty). Further, the ideas of power or control associated with kingship in them correlate well with secular understandings of kingship as being primarily about power or control. Absent some critical content in worship services to control for or correct such impressions, the vision Jesus and the early Church bring to the nature of God’s kingdom, where the last are first, the poor are blessed, the rich are “sent empty away,” and the greatest are to be servants of all, can easily be missed.

What does it mean that what Jesus is most admired for in these most widely sung songs in the United States is his power and control? What are the effects of what here appears to be a very narrow range of metaphorical understanding of the nature of God and God’s interactions with the world?

Certainly, one CCLI Top 100 list from the beginning of 2017 cannot offer definitive answers to such questions. But it certainly raises them, especially at a time in this nation’s history when there appears to be a high regard for authoritarianism

among white American evangelicals who form the bulk of the political base of the current President of the United States, and especially given that white evangelicals also form the majority of the subscribers to the CCLI license and the singers of contemporary worship music reflected in its Top 100.³² One response could be to suggest that, at the very least, both the explicit and the null curricula³³ of these songs could have the (perhaps unintended) effect of underwriting authoritarian and militaristic views of God and human power.

How Mature is the Contemporary Worship Music Market?

There is a widely accepted axiom in global market economics referred to as the “Rule of Three.” The Rule of Three has been developed by economists Jagdish Sheth, Can Uslay, and Rajendra Sisodia in a journal article³⁴, and in greater detail in Sheth and Sisodia’s, *The Rule of Three: Surviving and Thriving in Competitive Markets*.³⁵ At the heart of their theory is the idea that any sufficiently mature market will have at most, and for the most part, *exactly* three major players, or “generalists.” These three generalists will control 70-90% of the market, and each will control at least 10% of the market. Alongside these will be a number of smaller players having 1-5% shares each, and others “in the ditch,” with 5-10% market share. These are in the most vulnerable position. Indeed, they are most likely to fail unless they determine to specialize and become outstanding niche players, or, typically through mergers and acquisitions, raise their net market share to 10% or more and begin to displace the least effective of the existing three generalists in the market.³⁶

As we have seen, of the spring 2017 CCLI Top 100, 78 songs are, in effect, the product of a single publisher/distributor, Capitol Records. There are no other “generalist” publishers in this market. Bethel Music, with 8 songs, would be “in the ditch,” and Elevation Worship, with 5, is on the cusp of being in the ditch or being a niche player. The other nine publishers on the list would all be niche.

According to the Rule of Three, the market for Contemporary Christian Worship Music would be considered far from mature. Indeed, it could be said to be quite unstable. Though it is not possible to establish a strong statistical case for “Capitol Records Effects” on the use of pronouns, names for God, or even musical forms of the songs in the spring 2017 CCLI Top 100, there are almost undoubtedly business and economic effects of there being only one generalist in this market, the kinds of effects one might expect from any monopoly in any business sector. These effects may be of two kinds. On the one hand there may be a lack of meaningful competition, which reduces incentives to innovate throughout the wider market. On the other, there is the danger that if the monopoly collapses (rather than splitting into separate competing companies), the market itself could virtually disappear.

What could be done to improve overall market conditions given the three players we are discussing (Capitol Records, Bethel Music, and Elevation Worship)? Capitol Records purchasing the administrative rights of either Bethel Music or Eleva-

tion Worship would only further consolidate Capitol's monopoly and destabilize the market further. Bethel Music, being "in the ditch" probably needs to look carefully either at specializing more deeply, and so intentionally shedding some market share, or, finding a way to gain more than a 10% market share. It could do this either by merging with Elevation Worship (if Elevation Worship wanted to move into a generalist position from its current niche, and would be willing to do so with a partner that may not share its theological tradition), or by finding another significant player in the music business (Sony? Universal?) to expand its marketing and thereby expand its market share beyond 10%. Elevation Worship could either remain a niche player, or, like Bethel Music partner with another major music publisher to work to more than double its spring 2017 results. If both Bethel Music and Elevation Worship sought different partners to increase their market share, we could see a more mature market with three generalist players, thus creating the potential for the whole market for contemporary/modern worship music, both its contributors and its end users (Christian congregations) to reap the benefits of a mature market for their work—real competition, incentive to innovate and diversify, and potentially better working conditions for all.

Conclusion

What's in a name? What's in the ways the most widely used copyrighted Christian worship songs in the United States and Canada address and name God? A careful examination of that question by analyzing data derived from one example of the CCLI Top 100 lists demonstrates the answers may be more wide-ranging than one might initially think.

It is probably no surprise to anyone familiar with relatively recent developments in contemporary or modern worship music and the nature of the congregations that use it that both feminist and mainline calls for inclusive and expansive language for God appear to go unheeded. What may be surprising is the *degree* to which they are unheeded: *totally*. One might have expected at least a few incidences of feminine pronouns or feminine images for God across the thousands of uses of pronouns, names, and titles represented on this list. There are none. In this corpus, God is addressed in predominantly masculine pronouns or titles, primarily recognized in the person and work of Jesus (male), and primarily metaphorized as King (masculine). Power and control exercised by masculine authority appear to be the primary ways God is understood in the song texts across this collection, and so also perhaps the primary ways God is communicated and reflected across the approximately 150,000 churches in the United States and Canada represented in these rankings.

It may also be somewhat surprising that there appear to be liturgical, theological, musical, and practical reasons for the rise of hybrid address songs, and particularly for the high percentage of these (70%) that can function at least in part as worship songs within the traditional structure of a contemporary worship set. With few exceptions (only three of 40, or 0.75%), hybrid address songs do not reflect

confusion nor carelessness in the ways they address God simply by being hybrid address songs. Careful attention to the use of forms of address in correlation with the increasingly complex structure of contemporary worship music since 2004, as well as a few well before that time still under copyright protection, indicate the general integrity with which these songs are composed and put to use in practice, how sets may be changing in construction, and why the rise of the hybrid address worship song is both practical and helpful for giving more congregations access to music that may work better for the talent level of their local worship ensembles.

Finally, by attending to the questions of who is marketing the music so many congregations are singing in the United States, we become aware of just how dominant one company is in this market (Capitol Records), and both the degree of influence this wields as a monopoly (apparently little in terms of text, undoubtedly much in terms of the business of contemporary Christian worship music development) and the immaturity, potential fragility, and opportunities for future growth in this market going forward.

What's in a name? While the spring 2017 CCLI Top 100 listing provides only a point in time snapshot of copyrighted worship music most used by approximately 150,000 congregations in The United States and Canada, it is a snapshot that raises important issues and questions about the theology, inclusiveness (or lack thereof), integrity, adaptability, and economics that lies at the heart of the worship life of millions of Christians in North America. And it's a snapshot that invites further investigation of CCLI Top 100 lists over time to discover how these and other possible trends have developed, and where they may be heading.

Notes

1. CCLI Top 100," <https://www.umcdiscipleship.org/worship/ccli-top-100>. This project, begun in 2015, involves a diverse group of ten United Methodist musicians and scholars who review the songs on CCLI Top 100 and provide scores, comments, and recommendations for use based on their theology, language, and singability.
2. As published at <https://songselect.ccli.com/search/results?List=top100> (accessed 1 May 2017). The current listing on that page reflects the fall (November) 2017 reporting. A partial listing of the fall 2017 Top 100 (released April 2017) may be found starting at <https://songselect.ccli.com/search/results?List=top100&CurrentPage=1>.
3. The CCLI website: <https://www.ccli.com>
4. "A History of CCLI," Christian Copyright Licensing International website, <https://us.ccli.com/about-ccli/history> accessed 1 February 2018 (accessed 5 February 2018) and phone conversation with CCLI staff, 5 February 2018.
5. "Fast Facts about American Religion," Hartford Institute for Religious Research, http://hirr.hartsem.edu/research/fastfacts/fast_facts.html#numcong (accessed 1 February 2018).
6. Calculation based on church statistics as reported on denominational websites: United Church of Canada, http://www.united-church.ca/search/locator/all?keyw=&mission_units_ucc_ministry_type_advanced=10&locll=&page=279; Anglican Church of Canada, <https://www.anglican.ca/about/organization/>; Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada, <http://www.elcic.ca/FindAChurch.cfm> (all accessed 5 February 2018).
7. "About Us," OneLicense, <https://www.onelicense.net/about-us> (accessed 1 February 2018).

8. In the CCLI Top 100 Vetting Project, we found 13 new songs from 2015 to 2016, and 15 from 2016-2017.
9. Data provided by Jeff Harvey, North American Sales Supervisor, CCLI, in telephone conversation on 6 February 2018.
10. There is substantial discussion in the wider church music world about how to describe or classify contemporary or modern worship music. I find the distinction made in the research from Faith Communities Today (FACT) to be the simplest, if not always the most accurate. Contemporary or modern worship music is characterized as being driven more by guitar and drums, following folk and rock/pop models than by choirs, piano, and organ following more classical models. See "Facts on Growth 2010" <http://faithcommunitiestoday.org/sites/default/files/FACTs%20on%20Growth%202010.pdf>, 11-12 (accessed 6 7 February 2018).
11. Leonel L. Mitchell, with Ruth A. Meyers, *Praying Shapes Believing, Revised Edition* (New York: Church Publishing, 2016). *Lex orandi, lex credendi*, or, in its original form, from Prosper of Aquitaine's *Indiculus de Gratia Dei*, "*legem credenda les statuat supplicandi*," c. 435 CE.
12. Robert Woods and Brian Walrath, eds. *The Message in the Music: Studying Contemporary Praise and Worship* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2007), 31-44.
13. Lester Ruth, "Some Similarities and Differences between Historic Evangelical Hymns and Contemporary Worship Songs" *The Artistic Theologian* 3 (2015): 68-86, <http://artistictheologian.com/journal/artistic-theologian-volume-3-2015/some-similarities-and-differences-between-historic-evangelical-hymns-and-contemporary-worship-songs/> (accessed 6 February 2018).
14. Michael A. Tapper, *Canadian Pentecostals, The Trinity, and Contemporary Worship Music: The Things We Sing* (Boston: Brill, 2017).
15. Counting "God" as gender neutral is debatable. I make that determination based on my observation that English revisions of hymns and liturgical texts to increase inclusivity have typically allowed for God to be used as a generic term. I am not convinced the songwriters in this collection would not imagine God as a masculine term, given there are no feminine pronouns or feminine metaphors for God to be found in it, and masculine terms far outnumber gender neutral metaphors for God.
16. See the About Us page for Capitol's CMG Publishing, <http://www.capitolcmgpublishing.com/?cid=26838> (accessed 6 February 2018).
17. Bethel Music is a ministry of Bethel Church, a non-denominational Pentecostal megachurch centered in Redding, California, with two main worship campuses, and a third being planted in Austin, Texas. For more, see <http://www.bethel.com>.
18. Elevation Worship is the music and worship ministry of Elevation Church, a multi-campus Southern Baptist megachurch with Reformed theology centered in Charlotte, North Carolina with eight satellites within a 50 mile radius and two as far away as Melbourne, Florida, and Toronto, ON, Canada. For more about the band and the church, see <http://elevationchurch.org>.
19. A classic but sometimes overlooked example of Trinitarian Collapse is found in stanza 4 of "In Christ Alone" (Keith Getty and Stuart Townend, © 2002 Thankyou Music). "Jesus commands my destiny" may sound like classic Calvinist predestinarian theology. But in the economy of the Trinity as normally expressed in Christian theology and in the scriptures (notably Ephesians 1:3-4, and Romans 8:28), it is the First Person, God the Father, not the Second, Jesus the Son, who predestines. It is surprising in this song that such a mistake in attribution would be made, since stanza 2 makes such a clear distinction between the persons and work of Jesus and God (presumably the First Person): "'Til on the cross where Jesus died the wrath of God was satisfied." Lester Ruth has coined a term to describe such First Person collapse onto the Second, "patrisuperfluidity," referring to the degree to which such collapse, combined with the overwhelming number of songs that address only the second person, seem to render the person and work of the First Person superfluous. An example of Trinitarian Collapse that demonstrates what might be called "pneumato-patrisuperfluidity" (my term for collapse of first person onto third) may be found in the bridge of "Here As in Heaven" (© 2015 Elevation Worship). The song as a whole is spoken about or to the Holy Spirit, but in the bridge the Spirit (rather than the Father) is addressed "Your kingdom come, you will be done as in heaven." Indeed, it is this theologically problematic section of the bridge that gives the entire song its title.

20. Pentecostal theology, in general, highlights the activity of the power of God through the person of the Holy Spirit, and Pentecostal worship music has been highly influenced by the Psalms and Revelation (*Lovin on Jesus*, 113), both of which, especially the former, are replete with King imagery for God.
21. Within Reformed theology generally, the primary theological emphasis is on the sovereignty or control of God over all things. Though for a different reason than in Pentecostal theology, this makes King as a title for God both highly appropriate and relatively frequent within Reformed liturgical texts, song, and preaching.
22. A controlling metaphor is commonly defined as a metaphor which appears by far the most frequently in describing a particular person or situation. A controlling metaphor provides the primary framework or environment or context in which that person or situation is described and understood. To say King is the controlling metaphor for the divine in this collection is to suggest that King has the effect of creating the framework for understanding the nature of the divine names in use (God, Lord, Jesus), terms which here function more as names than as metaphors.
23. Swee Hong Lim and Lester Ruth, *Lovin on Jesus: A Concise History of Contemporary Worship* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2017) 14, 68-70.
24. See an example of this here: <https://youtu.be/fBHcvJhc6Pk> (accessed 7 February 2018). Though a few people are singing with the soloist on the verse, many more start singing on the pre-chorus, and the place comes alive with everyone singing and gesturing strongly on the chorus. The exhortatory function of the pre-chorus works.
25. The other two examples are “King of My Heart” (John Mark McMillan and Sarah McMillan, © 2015 Meaux Jeux Music, Raucous Ruckus Publishing, Macmillan, Sarah), and “Resurrecting” (Stephen Furtick, Chris Brown, Mack Brock, Wade Joye, and Matthew Ntlele © 2015 Elevation Worship).
26. *Lovin’ on Jesus*, 80.
27. This practice gave rise to the dismissive characterization of praise and worship and some contemporary worship music as “7-11 songs”: 7 words repeated 11 times.
28. I will add here that changes in projection software have facilitated the ability to alter or vary the distinct elements of these songs in real time. While a PowerPoint slide set has typically been linear, so that “real-time” alterations have until more recent versions required obvious moving back and forth in the presentation, packages such as Media Shout and Easy Worship allow for real-time, seamless re-ordering or placement of any given slide within a stack, much as a nod or a signal from a lead singer or instrumentalist can indicate to the rest of the band where the song is going next with no apparent shift in flow.
29. Chuck Fromm, editor of *Worship Leader Magazine*, and primary founding producer of Maranatha! Music, in a presentation to the United Methodist Symposium on the Future of Worship, September, 2014, United Theological Seminary, Dayton, Ohio.
30. Lester Ruth, “Some Similarities and Differences...,” 70. Depending on the English translation, King may appear as a title or name for God between 80 and 90 times in the Psalter.
31. Ruth, citing Clive Marsh and Vaughn S. Roberts, *Personal Jesus: How Popular Music Shapes Our Souls* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012) 83-84, notes a similar phenomenon in “Some Similarities and Differences...,” 71.
32. While CCLI does not keep records of the ethnicity of its subscribers, Jeff Harvey noted in my conversation with him on February 6, 2018, that the number of identifiable non-white churches by historically black or other ethnic denominational affiliation within their subscriber base are substantially lower than those of predominantly white denominations. This is not surprising given overall demographics in the United States. Harvey also noted a further potential problem in reporting, especially among black churches. Many of these churches have a substantial canon of songs, including copyrighted songs, they can sing and play by memory without reproducing the words. These songs do not need to be reported for licensing purposes, and, Harvey noted, probably are not. This may, in part, account for the under-representation of black gospel and non-white song in the CCLI Top 100.
33. “Explicit curriculum” and “null curriculum” are terms from the disciplines of educational theory

and curriculum development. Explicit curriculum refers to what is being taught directly through the materials and teaching methods used to teach it. “Null curriculum” refers to what is not taught, or what is missing from what is being taught, with the implication within educational theory that what is not taught reflects, enacts (intentionally or unintentionally), or causes the marginalization or suppression of that knowledge, group, or form of cultural expression. For an article describing the value of null curriculum, see David J. Flinders, Nel Noddings, and Stephen J. Thornton, “The Null Curriculum: Its Theoretical Basis and Practical Application,” *Curriculum Inquiry* 16:1 (Spring 1986), 33-42, also available here: <http://wp.vcu.edu/hhughesdecatu/wp-content/uploads/sites/1868/2013/01/Null-curriculum.pdf> (accessed 5 February 2018).

34. Jagdish Sheth, Can Uslay, and Rajendra S. Sisodia, “The Globalization of Markets and the Rule of Three,” 2002, <https://docs.google.com/viewerng/viewer?url=https://www.jagsheth.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/The-Globalization-of-Markets-and-the-Rule-of-Three.pdf&hl> (accessed 1 February 2018).
35. Jagdish Sheth and Rajendra S. Sisodia, *The Rule of Three: Surviving and Thriving in Competitive Markets* (New York: The Free Press, 2010).
36. *Ibid.* pp. 7-8.

